

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Of the

Suffolk County Legislature

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 9:30 am.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson

Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair

Legislator Kara Hahn

Legislator Bridget Fleming

Legislator Tom Cilmi

Legislator Leslie Kennedy

Legislator William Spencer

Legislator Monica Martinez

Also In Attendance:

Legislator Tom Muratore - Legislative District #4

Legislator William Lindsay - Legislative District #8

Legislator Robert Trotta - Legislative District #13

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature

Jason Richberg - Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

DJ Russo - Legislative Aide/Clerk of the Legislature's Office

John Ortiz - Senior Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office

Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning

Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Ray Donnelly - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Eva Greguski - Aide to Deputy Presiding Officer Calarco

Alysa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn

Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Elizabeth Alexander - Aide to Legislator Spencer

Liz Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming

Chris DeLuca - Aide to Legislator Cilmi

Lisa Pinkard - Aide to Legislator Martinez

Greg Moran - Aide to legislator Trotta

Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore

Brendan Chamberlain - Aide to Legislator Muratore

Katie Horst - Director-Intergovernmental Relations/CE's Office

John Morofino - County Executive Assistant

Robert Braun - Deputy Bureau Chief/County Attorney's Office

James Cerone - Sergeant/Chief of Department's Office - SCPD

Anthony Paparatto - Chief-of-Staff/SC Sheriff's Office

Gil Anderson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Department of Public Works

Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer/Suffolk County Department of Public works

Alexander Prego - Assistant Director of Traffic Safety/SD Department of Public Works

Paul Margiotta - Executive Director/Traffic Parking Violations Bureau

Lisa Rosenthal - QR Care Card

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

Thomas Bouchard - CEO/Optottraffic
John O'Connor - COO/Optottraffic
Howard Lilly - Public Safety Liaison/Optottraffic
David Schwartz - Gerstman, Schwartz, Malito Law Firm/Gov't Relations
Diane Cahill - Partner/Gotham Government Relations
Kristen Senese - Associate/Gotham Government Relations
Nicole Epstein - Associate/Gotham Government Relations
Lou Tutone - 1st Vice-President/Suffolk County Police Benevolent Assoc
Jim Roddin - Trustee/Superior Officer's Association
Marlene Patrella - Suffolk Citizens Against Corruption
Kathleen Cole - Suffolk Citizens Against Corruption
Colleen Flood - Suffolk Citizens Against Corruption
Frank Vetro - Suffolk Citizens Against Corruption
Marie Tooker - Resident of Flanders
Maude Pollack - Resident of Hampton Bays
Charles Clampet - Topic/Corruption
Chris Spilberg - Fire Control Solutions
Anthony Varajao - All Island Fire Protection
Steven Wiener - Resident of Smithtown
Peter Fiorillo - Resident of Nassau County
Merri Kanzenberg - Resident of Commack/Red Light Camera Program
Hector Gavilla - Resident of Dix Hills/Red Light Camera Program
Dawn Nappi - Resident of Holbrook/Red Light Camera Program
Warren Ovalle - Resident of Central Islip/Red Light Camera Program
James Emanuele - Red Light Camera Program
Rose Van Guilder - Alliance for Independent Long Island
Vincent Rasulo - Resident of East Patchogue/Red Light Camera Program
Michael McDermott - Suffolk County Libertarian Party/Red Light Camera
Susan Helleis - Resident of Patchogue/Red Light Camera Program
Stephen Ruth Jr. - Resident of Centereach/Red Light Camera Program
Stephen Ruth - Resident of Ridge/Red Light Camera Program
Tara Garced - Resident of Selden/Red Light Camera Program
Linda Frego - Resident of Ronkonkoma/Red Light Camera Program
Ron Bracci - Resident of Melville/Red Light Camera Program
Mohammed Siagha - Resident of Central Islip/Corruption
Sarah Lynn Fogelstrom - Resident of Hapauge/Red Light Camera Program
Rachel Lugo - Traffic Safety
Carlos Rivera - Resident of Brentwood
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney & Diana Flesher - Court Stenographers

*(*The meeting was called to order at 9:41 A.M. *)*

*(*The following testimony was taken & transcribed by
Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer*)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, good morning, everyone. We'll start the Public Safety Committee meeting. If everyone could please stand for the pledge of allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

Salutation

And a moment of silence for the men and women who defend our country at home and abroad.

Moment of Silence Observed

Thank you. Okay. I do have one piece of correspondence, it is from Matthew. It says, "*I understand the Legislature is discussing the Red Light Camera Program today and I would like to add my two cents. Apparently, for the people who don't like stopping for red lights, the program is a nuisance. For those who follow the law and have the right-of-way when entering an intersection, this law is having the intended effect of making those who would flaunt the law think twice when approaching a red light. For any problems it might cause such as cars being rear-ended while stopping, this is another problem we have on the roads being -- following no -- following too close, better known as tailgating. We can't afford to hire enough Police to monitor the traffic situation on Long Island.*

The program should stay in place and, if anything, it should be supplemented with speed cameras if we're really serious about getting this growing traffic problem under control. The technology is out there, let's utilize it and make the roads safer for all.

A AAA study says that the majority of people are in favor of speed cameras, but as usual the violators are usually the loudest ones to complain as to what happened -- as what happened in Nassau County when speed cameras were installed by schools and the violators complained about getting tickets and the County backed down and shut down the program. Amazing the lawbreakers won out. Maybe we should take a survey." And that was from Matthew.

I have no other correspondence. I am going to -- we do have a lot of cards for the public portion. I do apologize to our presenters, but I am going to have to do public portion first. So the first speaker I have is Kathleen Cole.

MS. PATRELLA:

I believe I was first. Marlene.

MR. SLAUGHTER:

Marlene was first.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I apologize. Yes, Marlene, I apologize. Kathleen, if you could hold off. Marlene Patrella was first, I'm sorry.

Marlene? No, this is Marlene. I apologize, Kathleen. A little bit of confusion there.

MS. PATRELLA:

Are you ready?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, go ahead. You have three minutes.

MS. PATRELLA:

Good morning. My name is Marlene Patrella. All that I'm telling you is upon information and belief. I'm calling for the investigation and/or removal of Acting Supreme Court Justice John Rouse. I am calling for this as a victim, an activist and a citizen of Suffolk County. I will not rehash the Newsday articles about DA Spota's wiretaps of Judge Rouse who was Brookhaven Town's Superintendent, but I am adding the packets you all have in front of you. It includes articles from 2012 on the drug bust in the Brookhaven Highway Department and the pay-to-pave articles concerning the donors that gave John Rouse money for Highway contracts by donating to his campaign in exchange for multi-million dollar Highway contracts. This is a pattern and practice of unscrupulous dealings on his watch as Superintendent of the Brookhaven Highway Department.

In November, 2012, Mr. Rouse was cross-endorsed and elected to the Suffolk County Court, and in January, 2015, was made an Acting Supreme Court Judge. When my case was transferred to him from another Supreme Court Judge, my attorney, who was checking on a return motion date in his chambers by e-mail, was told to resubmit all motions, they are lost somewhere in the courthouse. Judge Rouse had my case on his calendar but never contacted my lawyer to tell him that. The motions were lost. After I contacted a Legislator's office concerning this, miraculously these papers were found in a matter of hours. It is a Federal crime under 18 USC 2071 that all Clerks are not to conceal, remove, alter any record, proceeding, document or anything filed with the County or court. The breach alone of rules would have cost me hundreds of dollars in delay.

Ultimately, in May, 2015, my case against Suffolk County before Judge Rouse was dismissed by Judge Rouse without even meeting my lawyer or having the case appear in front of him, and very little depositions were taken of me and none of the defendants. The package you have in front of you contains a list of Supreme Court cases before Judge Rouse which he dismissed since taking the Acting Supreme Court position in January, 2015. On June 2nd, I appeared before the Legislature and made this complaint on him, that he was dismissing all plaintiffs cases who were suing the County of Suffolk or the Town of Brookhaven where Judge Rouse was a prominent elected official for two years. All cases before Judge Garguilo were given to Judge Rouse in 2015 of January. Judge Rouse's sister is Patricia A Rouse; she's an attorney working in the Suffolk County Attorney's Office. Judge Rouse makes no disclosure of this fact on the record in any case which was dismissed with Suffolk County under defendants. What stopped the dismissals was the public speech I made here last year. He has not since dismissed a County or town case.

As an activist, I have made it my daily task to observe Judge Rouse, his calendar and contact any plaintiff or attorney appearing before him in a County or town matter to disclose his connection to these entities. I had written Judge Heinrich, he is the Administration Judge listening to my -- listing my grievances with Judge Rouse. Judge Heinrich's Law Clerk, Mr. Robert Quinlin, responded by addressing only one of my issues saying it was no big deal and that Judge Rouse did not have to disclose his sister's employment as an attorney in the Suffolk County Attorney's Office.

(Timer Sounded)

Low and behold, six months later Mr. Robert Quinlin was cross-endorsed and became a Supreme Court Judge in 2015. Mr. Quinlin had been a Brookhaven Town Attorney during the time of Mr. Rouse's tenure as Highway Department Superintendent in Brookhaven Town. The web is so tangled and stretching. Now, I hope the Feds can untangle it. All of this election maneuvering and cross-endorsing and finagling has only caused my complaints to be swept under the rug along with evidence of wrong-doing and the wire taps.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Marlene, your time is up. Are you almost done?

MS. PATRELLA:

I have two sentences.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Finish up, please. Thank you.

MS. PATRELLA:

Which caught many public officials in illegal dealings with no repercussions. No charges levied. Mr. Rouse was clearly on the wire taps of DA Spota, he was even spoken to about McPartland. How do you expect as public servants to let this County sink to a level so low it effects the judicial process and the citizen's right to due process?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you, Marlene. Thank you very much.

Applause

And just so everyone knows, we do have a lot of speakers. You have three minutes to speak, I would appreciate it if everyone could try and stay within that timeline. Because we do have an another committee and we have presentations also. So the next speaker, again, Kathleen Cole.

MS. COLE:

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for having us here today. And just for the record, I am against the red light cameras, but that's not my issue today. My name is Kathy Cole, I own and operate Gym Door Repair in Suffolk County. I have been a vendor for local school districts, providing safety inspections and repairs on school gymnasium equipment for over 30 years. I live in Great River and have been a tax paying, law abiding citizen -- \$30,000 in taxes, actually -- for 30 years. Tom Cilmi I believe will vouch for my integrity, I've known him many of those years.

LEG. CILMI:

(Shook head in the affirmative).

MS. COLE:

Education Law 409-F which relates to the construction, maintenance and operation of electrically-operated partitions located in the schools is unique to New York State and New York City schools. There is no other requirement like this in the nation. It was enacted in 2001 after the death of the second New York State student crushed and killed in their school gym electric partition, one death here in Melville, Deanna Moon on Long Island. I have tried since 2011 to report to the Suffolk DA serious and criminal events going on in our local school districts; collusion, wire fraud, identity theft and price gauging of the taxpayers, in addition to endangering the well-being of our students.

Certain education and BOCES officials, in an attempt to shield the massive non-compliance and the \$140 million of mandated, non-discretionary funding with this law, unique to New York State. These officials have conspired with one particular Suffolk County company to eliminate competitive bidding in local Long Island school districts for gymnasium safety, goods and services. As I hired private investigators and have gotten inside tips from public employees, I uncovered more and more fraud. I was referred to the Government Corruption Bureau of the Suffolk DA after the Labor and Rackets Bureau and the Financial Crimes Unit of the Suffolk DA raided the Suffolk County company in March of 2014. After receiving my FOILS and listening to my tape recordings, they decided to raid. The

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

same bureau run by Mr. McPartland who is now a target of a Federal Investigation for covering up for Mr. James Burke who is in Federal prison. The CEO of the Suffolk County company was debarred by the SEC for securities fraud and fined \$1.9 million personally for his part in the \$138 million simple technology scandal here on Long Island.

I was advised for almost two years by the Suffolk DA's Government Corruption Bureau, as I provided additional evidence of fraud, to be patient. I sat and watched as the children were being endangered and the taxpayers were being abused by this company, with the help of certain education and BOCES officials. I was recently informed by a confidential informant involved in the investigation that there would be no indictment or debarments, as I was told for the past two years. This was being covered up, I was told. The government employees involved in this fraud would face no penalties.

This informant went above the Suffolk DA's head, and I have also reported just recently to certain Federal investigators this cover up at the highest levels of the Suffolk DA. There are more worried about covering their own ass than prosecuting criminals, I was told by this informant. Mr. Spota must step down or be removed and the cases, especially those in the Government Corruption Bureau, must be reinvestigated by either a Federal Investigator or someone appointed by an Inspector General. The taxpayers and the victims of the Suffolk DA deserve no less. Many of them are in this audience today, as I am sure you all agree.

I applaud your recent desire to question the DA, but before doing so, you should first question some of the victims of the DA's Office so that you know the real questions to ask and the real issues to report to the Federal Investigators.

I also implore you to join me and the other citizens in this audience and beyond who have petitioned the Governor in asking him to convene proceedings to investigate the allegations that have been made regarding DA Spota's conduct so that the Governor can remove him if they are proven to be true. I would like to submit for your review and for the Legislators record the petition that we submitted last week to the Governor. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And you did give us a copy of your statement?

MS. COLE:

Yes, I have everything right here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I would appreciate it. Josh will get a copy of the statement from you. Okay, the next speaker is Merri Kanzenberg.

Okay. Anyone who is speaking, rather than coming and stepping over the rope, we prefer that you don't attempt to trip yourself and take -- go in the other direction, go around. Thank you. Go ahead.

MS. KANZENBERG:

Hi. My name is Merri Kanzenberg, I reside in Commack. I've spoken to you on three occasions regarding removal of these red light cameras. I'm sure there are others that would like to speak, so I'm going to quickly summarize my reasons for the removal of these cameras.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

First, recently the data obtained regarding these cameras showed 44 out of a hundred cameras increased rear-end collision. All the cameras in my Commack neighborhood have increased in rear-end collision: 184% increase in accidents with injuries, Commack Road and Dorothea; 122% at Indian Head Road have increased accidents with injuries. There is no data whatsoever to support improved safety by adding right-on-red violation. No fatalities ever occur because of right-on-red, no data to support any accidents either.

Cameras are strategically placed for revenue, otherwise Vanderbilt Motor Parkway, a black dot area where numerous fatalities including a police officer, yet no camera is there. Oddly enough, you can't make a right-on-red. Commack Meat Farms; why is there a camera there when there is zero reported fatalities, yet the largest grossing revenue? Why? But you make -- you can make a right-on-red. Cameras have shown zero data that proves effective at stopping red light runners or decrease in T-bone collisions. Tickets issued are far greater for right-on-red violation. Tickets issued for red light runners is minimal. The real reason is revenue, not safety. Shame on any of you that do not support Trotta's bill with these facts.

Florida Supreme Court just upheld the illegal use of these cameras because no law enforcement agent is overseeing these violations. We have no right to appeal. I want my refund. Is Suffolk prepared to refund the approximate 300K per camera/per year based on the Florida Supreme Court ruling? You think you have budget problems now? You're going to have worse ones. We've got to really become solidified.

I spoke with Commack Ambulance and these cameras are having an effect on workers in their own cars arriving to work to respond to a call. People will not move over if they have to go through these cameras; was that ever considered? Fire rescuers, was that considered either?

In closing, these cameras fail to improve your constituents' safety. They are raping us of monies. We need to live here. I urge all of you to support Robert Trotta's bill today. Enough already, please don't table this.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Kennedy has a question for you. Mary? Legislator Kennedy, a question, yes?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I have a statement.

MR. NOLAN:

Question only, we'll debate the bill later.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We're not supposed to be doing statements, and we've got a lot of cards. A question.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll speak to you after committee.

MS. KANZENBERG:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

When we get to the bill we can make our statements, but we really need to get these cards through and our presentations. Next is Hector Gavilla. Okay, like I said before, there is a rope over here. If

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

you do want to get up and speak, please don't step over the rope, go around.

MR. GAVILLA:

Hello. My name's Hector Gavilla and I oppose the Red Light Camera Program. My first question is to Kate Browning and Robert Calarco; why are you pimping for the red light camera companies, Xerox?

(Brief Pause)

This is extremely upsetting when you have the majority of people who are being victimized by the red light cameras. I have a copy of the 2014 report. It's no longer opinion or conjecture that these cameras are causing more accidents, because we have the data from 2014. Rear-end collisions have increased by 42%, according to your own report, at those locations. At 44 of the 100 locations, there was an increase in personal injury accidents, and that is a fact. You are also illegally charging a \$30 admin fee, because I also have a copy of the New York State Vehicle and Traffic Section 1111-b where New York State only authorizes Suffolk County to charge \$50 per ticket, no more than that. And according to the contract that you have with Xerox, there is absolutely no cost to Suffolk County for operating this program. So why on Earth are you adding a \$30 admin fee? I have the answer; it's called greed. You are not here working for the middle class people, you're actually hurting them. An \$80 ticket is a lot for a lot of people. And it is not helping to prevent T-bone type collisions or any accidents at all, because according to the 2014 reports, between 2013 and 2014, there was only a reduction in total accidents of 33. There were only 33 less accidents from 2013 and 2014. The program is not working at all.

Also, recently in East Patchogue there was a fatality of a pedestrian who was walking along the side and we were promised that these red light cameras would stop those types of incidents. The person died at a red light camera location, it did not prevent the person from making a bad decision. What is successful about the program is that it has generated \$33 million in revenue, so that's about \$300,000 per location that you're generating in revenue.

Please support Robert Trotta's bill to suspend the program and ultimately end it. As mentioned previously, the State of Florida has made it illegal to have red light cameras, giving New Yorkers another reason to move down to Florida. You're hurting the people here and what you're doing is illegal. We are making people aware that today you have a vote and that in the Legislature you have a vote. People are watching how you do. Today is a day for you to reset any of the past mistakes that you have made. We are watching you and we're going to make everyone aware of how you vote on Robert Trotta's bill. Have a great day.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Next speaker is Colleen Flood. Colleen Flood? I'm sorry, I did not know if you could hear me. And after that will be Frank Vetro.

MS. FLOOD:

Good morning. Thank you for having me here this morning. I bring to you an issue of a bit more of a sensitive nature for myself; it's about my personal experience with the District Attorney's Office. I am a survivor of domestic violence and a survivor of partner rape. I'm not so sure that I'm going to be a survivor of the District Attorney's Office.

*(*Ms. Flood took a pause and a deep breath*)*

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

I apologize. My experience with the District Attorney's Office has been a long one and not one that has been pleasant. Although all of the ADAs that I've had to deal with have been pleasant and more than helpful, it has been very difficult for me to convey to them my case and what happened in my situation. Unfortunately, what was given a statement to be a Class A Felony Rape was immediately charged as a Class E Felony Rape. A Class A Felony Rape involves forcible compulsion, which entails the victim being forced physically and beaten, which I was. Immediately the DA's Office charged the defendant with an E Felony; rape, lack of consent, not incapacitated. And yes, there was a lack of consent, but there was also a beating. I wasn't even given a chance to have the defendant charged with what I accused him of.

In the midst of that, I was contacted by an ADA in the Sex Crimes Unit and told that the crime was going to be knocked down to an A Misdemeanor, Sexual Misconduct. I suffered a beating at the hands of this person and it has been knocked down to an A Misdemeanor. At this point, I've called the District Attorney's Office at least once a week and recently several times in a week, each time my case is coming up on the court calendar. I have attended when I've been subpoenaed and nothing has come of it. I cannot get a return phone call and when I do, if the call is missed I return the call repeatedly and get no call back.

The defendant was ROR'd on a rape charge when the ADA asked for \$30,000 bail. It took me a year and two months to come forward with what happened to me because this was a man that I lived with for six years. And after a year and two months, when I came forward I was told that because there was no photos of my bruises, it would not be prosecuted as an A Felony. Now it's basically down to a slap on the wrist.

(Timer Sounded)

He is to be offered a plea. I have not been informed of what that plea is to me and I have called repeatedly and not gotten a return phone call. This is not necessarily the fault of the ADA that is on the case at the moment, but the fact that she's handling probably 35 to 50 cases a day. And when I have spoken with her, she hasn't even had an opportunity to read my file. There is a recording that the DA's Office has that supports what happened to me and the defendant crying to me on the recording, pleading me not to call the police on him because he was only trying to tie me up, not trying to have sex with me, and that he bashed my head and my knee into the floor while he was doing so. And when I speak to the ADA, they haven't even really listened to this recording. Once again, I don't fault the Assistant District Attorneys in the DA's Office, but the DA is the one that they answer to. And these types of crimes, not only mine, are being laughed at. He will most likely walk away with a slap on the wrist and I haven't even gotten an opportunity to say what has actually happened to me.

He's charged right now with four Misdemeanor crimes, A Misdemeanors. One of them is endangering the welfare of a child; that child is our 4-year old daughter that we have in common who walked in on him choking me, which is the only reason that he stopped. I offered the ADA's office a recording of him apologizing for choking me and they told me they didn't need it, it would just cause more time in the courtrooms to submit that tape.

I'm pleading with you to follow Kathy Cole's lead and investigate this District Attorney, because I'm not the only person that has had this story and I'm not the only person who has experience with this defendant. No one else has had the nerve to come forward. So I'm pleading with you to listen to the victims of Suffolk County and the survivors of this type of crime and realize that the District Attorney is pushing it aside and not prosecuting it the way it should be. Thank you for your time.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Colleen.

MR. PRESSMAN:

Stand up for what's right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The next one is Frank Vetro. And if you would please be quiet in the audience or you will be removed.

MR. VETRO:

Good morning, everybody. I'm going to piggy-back off of what my friends Kathy Cole and Colleen Flood just told you. And I'm going to preface this by saying everything I say is well documented and backed up by a criminal defense attorney and former Suffolk County Prosecutor Phillip Jusino.

My name is Frank Vetro, I'm a career educator, published author and a radio personality here in Suffolk County. In fact, some of the panel has been on my show numerous times, my radio show numerous times. In 2006 I was a high school principal in Hampton Bays, that's until I was maliciously arrested doing to Riverhead Jail for a crime I didn't commit. Police Commissioner Richard Dormer went in front of the media and publicly called me a terrorist. I lost my job, my career, couldn't find employment for many years. I was living in my car, left for dead. That's when I uncovered the corruption. I fought back.

I discovered the woman who pressed charges was the real criminal. In 2001 this school teacher manipulated and endangered the welfare of her students; used that to file charges on another man and have him arrested. It was covered up by Middle Country School District, buried. Four years later, not only did they cover it up, they allowed her to do the same thing with another student; take her out of school, spend time in her home, in her bedroom, behind closed doors, drank alcohol. This student was known as her lesbian lover. Well, she manipulated that student to hating me, forged a conspiracy against me and had me arrested. Now, the police, the authorities, District Attorneys, they knew all of this, that's why they didn't follow these identification procedures. They violated my Miranda Rights, used doctored and illegally obtained evidence, falsified arrest records, withheld evidence which proved my innocence and that they didn't even have probable cause. They ensured my destruction by preventing me from obtaining employment so I would never work again. They destroyed evidence that the judge ordered them to turn over, evidence which proved that the officers had a relationship with this rogue teacher. But why would they do this? You know the term; it's called selective prosecution. Cover for their friends and family, prosecute innocent people to advance their own agendas. That's what they do. It's called trickle down; all arrows point to the same man. This panel has said that they need more evidence before requesting Spota's resignation; we have it. I have it. All arrows lead to Thomas Spota.

For the 6th and 7th Precinct and the District Attorney's Office gave me the runaround after I discovered this for four or five years. Ultimately it ended with the District Attorney Detective saying the statutes are up, they can no longer do anything. When I asked who was in charge of the cover-up, I was escorted out of the District Attorney's Office right here in Hauppauge. Another detective said, *Well, you're not famous, so what happens to you doesn't matter.* My life doesn't matter? I'm somebody's son, somebody's uncle, somebody's brother. My life does matter, as do all the lives of your constituents here, the other victims. If you need more evidence -- respectively, people -- I have it. Don't look any further than Frank Vetro. I have boxes of evidence. You want evidence? You got it. So do they. They're all here in front of you. We are pleading with you. Do the right thing, prevent another destroyed life. Prevent another suicide. I couldn't be more serious; prevent another suicide. You guys know how to find me. Frank Vetro. Thank you for your time.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next speaker is Dawn Nappi. Dawn Nappi? Oh, there you are. Good morning.

MS. NAPPI:

My name is Dr. Dawn Marie Nappi and I felt it is very important to appear before you again today to set the record straight. On May 10th I spoke at a public hearing and I shared with you my tragic story of my daughter Angelica's death. Steven was the man who took my daughter Angelica from me when he ran through a red light. The County Executive's Office had me believe that if there were a red light camera at that intersection, that my daughter's life would not have been taken. After reviewing documents and statistics, I was surprised to see that accidents increased at 46% where red light cameras were located, with some locations increasing over 100%. To a grieving mother, the claim that this is a safety program is overstretched. These red light cameras do not prevent safety, as well as it does not identify who was driving the car.

As I said on May 10th before a public hearing, Steven ran the red light but he was not the owner of the vehicle. To find out that there were no engineering standards in place to determine location and that right turns on red account for more than 80% of the camera violations, these cameras never would have prevented the man that struck and killed my daughter. I promised my daughter Angelica before I pulled her off of life support that I would do whatever it takes to make sure that this would not happen to anyone else. The County Executive took that eagerness and they beguiled me to support the argument of the red light cameras. Any and every elected official should be ashamed of themselves if they use any family's tragedy --

Applause

-- to promote their political career, or in this case, a safety program that is not working or effective.

If this program did, in fact, improve safety, then there would not be \$32 million in revenue that goes to fund the police contracts. In theory, when a program works there is less of. Thirty-two million is not about safety, it's about the money. Well, as a parent who buried a child, I don't care about the money. So let the record be straight; I do not support the red light camera programs. You should shut down the program or put it on a referendum to allow the public to decide. Steven was not the only one who caused tragedy and has taken something from me. Mr. Bellone has also taken to promote a hidden agenda for propaganda and that is the Red Light Camera Program. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Dr. Nappi.

LEG. TROTTA:

Excuse me? I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You have a question?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yeah. Dr. Nappi?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Dr. Nappi, question for you.

LEG. TROTТА:

On behalf of the citizens of Suffolk County, I apologize to you and I'm -- it's disgraceful what the County Executive did to you and I apologize for the rest of the citizens of Suffolk County.

MS. NAPPI:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No question?

Applause

LEG. KENNEDY:

That wasn't a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

He said he had a question. Okay. We have yet to get to the bill.

We can make our statements then. We have a lot of cards and they just keep building. So if we could please not make statements. Warren Ovalle or Ovalley; I apologize if I'm not saying your name right.

MR. OVALLE:

It's Ovalle; thank you, though.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you.

*(*Legislator Hahn entered the meeting at 10:16 A.M. *)*

MR. OVALLE:

This is about the red light cameras itself. Thirty-two million dollars a year in revenue is very extreme, with not one penny going back to the public or to safety issue. Why can't you take five million of that 32 million and put it into safety programs, like we have for addicts all across the County and the State. We have these drug programs that promote less drug issues or problems itself, it could be the same when you come with a safety issue and defensive driving or such and such.

These tickets are issued for red light cameras and it's a very minimum for blowing the red light itself, that there's no points put on the license, there's no infractions, it's just a red light -- it's just a ticket itself of 85 or \$50, whatever the case may be. So if I'm a millionaire, I'll blow that red light every day and it will not stop me from ever blowing that red light because all I have to do is cut a check. This is sad. This is disgusting. Propaganda and the money you're using to fund the Police Department? Where are the Police? Aren't they supposed to be on the roads? They're not on the roads anymore. They're nowhere to be found.

Applause

You have these cameras watching everybody. This is sad. When will you people do something? Show us that we matter. That's all I have to say to you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. The next speaker is James Emanuele.

MR. EMANUELE,

My name is James Emanuele. Bear with me. Legislator Browning, could you answer a question for me?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We don't answer questions.

MR. EMANUELE:

Well, you know, I'm going to ask it anyway. Who has the final say in the timing of a red light at an intersection monitored by Xerox cameras in Suffolk County? For six months now I've watched citizens up here, including myself, testify as to the retiming of these intersections and the hazard it caused. I'm amazed that nobody is making an inquiry to Xerox, to Hink Electric, to anybody that has the ability to actually retime these intersections.

You know, when I was a police officer in this County there was a chronic question that would come up on emotional tests and it was always the same sort of question. Repair shop removes a manhole cover on the street where they're located, cars hit it, they get damaged, the repair shop makes money. And at some point somebody is injured; they either fall into the hole or they're injured in an accident. You're the patrolman, what do you have? And what you have is an assault in New York, a reckless assault. Minimally reckless endangerment, even without an injury. You know, there's a tendency in bureaucracies where everything gets lost in the source. Everybody is just doing their job, they're just following orders or they just don't know anything. And I want to tell you all, at some point, sadly, we've had enough accidents at these intersections, but somebody is going to be seriously injured. I've watched these intersections. When you're shortening a yellow signal to two or three seconds, there is no way to stop. You have a simultaneously green on the other side which we never had before in Suffolk County. And God forbid somebody gets killed, somebody is going to be held responsible for this. And the reason I'm here today, and I've been here a few times, is never let it be said it wasn't said. Never hide behind that you didn't know or nobody came up here and warned you or told you this was going on, because there's a tendency in government for everybody to look around and say, *Well, I just didn't know*. We're responsible for our actions. I expect everybody here to be responsible for their actions. I expect something done. Robert Trotta is the only one that stood up and is doing something to stop this pondering of the citizens of Suffolk County.

Applause

And that's exactly what it is, it is a plundering of the citizens of this County who already are stretched to the max because this County is bankrupt and is doing anything it can to take money out of our pockets. It's an absolute disgrace. You folks should address it today. I have no faith that you will. I think the monetary situation is so dire in this County, this is a revenue flow and you're going to continue to do this, even if you continue to jeopardize lives. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And the next speaker is Steven Wiener. And I think point of information; we do have a presentation. Our DPW is here, they are the ones who monitor the timing on cameras, not Xerox, and they will be speaking when we get to the issue at hand. So, Steven?

MR. WIENER:

Yes, thank you. My name is Steve Wiener, I've owned a home in Smithtown for 30 years. I'm talking about a different subject; I'm talking about the alarm permit fee. I just paid my taxes yesterday and there's a line in there, Suffolk County Police. The fact that this new fee is in place, it's not a fee, it's a tax. It's one more tax. It's one more way of pulling some more money out of our pockets.

Home alarms, I believe, are necessary. Anyone who reads the paper knows that. And home alarms are mechanical and electrical appliances. All of you have them. You're going to charge us every time one of our appliances breaks. Have you ever had one break? Your washing machine, a car break down, a flat tire? My wife had a flat tire a while back, and while she was waiting for me to come and help her, a police car stopped by. Am I going to get charged for that because the police car stopped?

The last time my alarm went off it was three years ago; it was the night of my son's wedding. In all the rushing around, we left the door ajar by accident. It's a big day; for those of you who have kids who got married, it's a big day. We made a mistake, oh, my God. A simple mistake that every one of us has made, and the bill's reaction is *let's get 'em. Let's get some money out of them.*

So I'm not thrilled with the cost of living on Long Island. I was born and raised in Nassau, I've lived in my house, raised my kids in Suffolk County for 30 years, but I'm willing to pay to stay here. I love Long Island. I've lived here my entire life. But you have to be fair; you have to be fair with how much money you're taking out of our pockets.

Every year I vote for the school budget, I've never voted against it. My kids are in their 30s. I'm not using the schools anymore. I support our police, I support all police. I have friends who are police and are retired police, and I thank them, I respect them. But charging a fee to own a necessity in your home, that's not fair. It's not reasonable. I think I'm a reasonable citizen. I take care of my home, I take care of my family, I watch out for my neighbors, my neighbors watch out for me. I pay my taxes, as I did yesterday, I clean-up after my dog. But I own an electrical appliance, and at some time it's going to have a failure. Everything does, that's fact. And I'm human; at some time I'm going to make a mistake. And the reaction of this bill is, *let's get 'em. Let's grab a few more bucks.*

Now, it's the police's job to respond. If we're lucky and if the policeman is lucky, it's caused by a malfunction and he goes on his way, a few minutes. And I'm grateful for that. If we're not so lucky, somebody's being robbed or hurt and the policeman is walking into a dangerous situation. Hopefully we're lucky and we're not unlucky. So I'm asking this committee, I understand that there is a bill to reduce fees, to give arbitration, to negate renewal fees, and that's being held in committee. When is that going to come out of committee and go to vote and will you vote for it? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Wiener, if you would stay there a minute, we do have a couple of questions.

MR. WIENER:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Have you read the -- did you read the original bill?

MR. WIENER:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So you're aware that if there is a malfunction due to weather, par surge, that you will not be ticketed for that false alarm.

MR. WIENER:

After I pay my registration fees each year.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That's another issue. I am the sponsor of the bill you're talking about. I have met with the alarm companies, we are trying to make a better bill, something that can work for everyone. Are you aware of how many false alarms that the police --

MR. WIENER:

Well, I understand there are a lot. There are also a lot of homes and a lot of homes and apartments in Suffolk County. I don't know the percentage --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. WIENER:

-- of how many homes -- maybe you would know. How many homes there are compared to how many false alarms there are.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right. And my Aide, we do have your contact information, we'd be happy to provide you with a copy of the newer legislation. But the reason why I'm not just going to throw it out is, you know, we want to make sure that it's a better bill working with the alarm companies also, because it does affect them. So we'll be in touch and we'll let you see what the finished --

MR. WIENER:

Finished product.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- bill is, yes.

MR. WIENER:

Is that expected soon?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We're going to hold off a couple of months. It's going to be in Riverhead and I'm going to hold it off so that the public hearing can also be done here in Hauppauge. So it won't take effect anyway until next year. There are some other issues internally that I'm trying to work on.

MR. WIENER:

The bill for the permits and fines have taken effect, or take effect June 1st, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It has taken effect at this time. But there are some other internal conversations that I'm having with the Police Department and also with our Counsel to try and resolve some of the issues even for this year.

MR. WIENER:

All right. I look forward to hearing from you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And Legislator Fleming has a question for you.

MR. WIENER:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Good morning, Mr. Wiener. Thank you so much for your input. Just a question. I don't want to put you on the spot personally --

MR. WIENER:

That's okay.

LEG. FLEMING:

But we've been trying to do some explorations around the program, as you know, and certainly Legislator Browning has. But would -- as a homeowner, would it be interesting to you to have a reduction in the permit fee if you were to install a video camera, or a video alarm system? I ask this because I don't know if you know, but the percentage of false alarms to real concerns is huge. And I represent the south fork of Long Island where the concern is even greater and when I was on the Southampton Town Board, we passed a more stringent, more expensive program because it was just -- it had such a devastating impact on personnel in our very small Police Department. So we're trying to explore ways to make that, you know, burden on the police less. I know in some communities across the country they require a video alarm which would reduce the need for an actual cop to go actually out to your house. And I've just been talking briefly with the Police Department about the possibility of this. As a homeowner, would it be interesting to you or would you find that too burdensome to have a reduction in your permit fee if you were to install a video camera that would prevent us from having to send a cop?

MR. WIENER:

I kind of have to look at it two ways. First of all, I have the expense of putting in a video system, which doesn't totally turn me off to it and I've considered it. And then the second thing is this is 2016 and then I can foresee in 2018 having a permit fee to have a video system. So, you know, anything can be taxed.

LEG. FLEMING:

The concept would be that the permit fee was reduced if you were to -- it's an incentive to install a video camera which would keep the cops from having to actually appear, you know, go to a false alarm.

MR. WIENER:

Again, I say today, today. I mean, yesterday or two years ago there was no fee to have an alarm system. And again, I feel an alarm system is a necessity. Although I've never been robbed, I do think it's a necessity to have in your home to protect your family, to protect your belongings. Obviously things change, and one of the things that changes is where can we get revenue? Where can we offset expense? And so, sure, anything -- anything I do today can, a couple of years down the road, have that effect of having a new fee. If I put in a video system, is there a fee for that? Today, no. I don't know what's going to happen in the future. I may put in a video feed, but again, I don't know where -- does a video system mean you don't have a fee for your alarm?

LEG. FLEMING:

The concept would be that it would lessen the burden of the homeowner if they took that step, it would make it easier on the police. But we don't have to go back and forth on it, I was just wondering if that would be interesting to you. I don't have any further questions.

MR. WIENER:

I just think it's one word -- it's one more little kind of -- it's a nickel and dime fee, I admit. But it's one more nickel and dime fee and we have a lot of them where we leave.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay, I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Wiener. Next speaker is Peter Fiorillo.

LEG. MURATORE:

Kate, I have question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. TROTTA:

Sir?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm sorry. Mr. Wiener, if you could come back. I'm sorry, I didn't catch that. Sorry, Legislator Muratore has a question.

MR. WIENER:

Sure.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Peter, if I may call you Peter.

MR. WIENER:

Steve. Steve.

LEG. MURATORE:

You said the day of your son's wedding --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's Steven.

LEG. MURATORE:

Steven, I'm sorry. My Aide can't read. The day of your son's wedding you allege that you think you had a false alarm.

MR. WIENER:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Let me ask you this. Are you sure you left the door ajar, or could possibly have someone come to the door after they saw everyone in the wedding party leave and attempt to enter and then the alarm sounded and they left. So are you really sure you had a false alarm or was there a possible attempted burglary? See, what I'm driving at here is when the cop comes, if there's nothing visible -- a broken window, a pushed-in door -- he knows that, you know, it's an attempted burglary. If nothing is disturbed, he's going to say, *Well, that's a false alarm*. When, in fact, someone could have pushed against the window, pushed on the door. So how are we going to really determine -- I

mean, we're going to be collecting money for this crime you commit.

MR. WIENER:

Right.

LEG. MURATORE:

How are we going to make sure that it wasn't an attempted burglary? I don't know that we addressed that in the bill.

MR. WIENER:

And I think you made a great point.

LEG. MURATORE:

No, I'm asking, are you sure that you left the door ajar at that time, or could possibly what I said happened?

MR. WIENER:

I guess three years later, I hadn't thought of that, but I guess you could be right. Either way, I would have been -- it would have counted as one of my false alarms or I would have -- or if I didn't have a permit, I would have been billed a fee. Because nobody was at my house taking things, you know. But that's a good point, and that's one more problem with the bill. I appreciate that.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, I'm experienced because I know my front door was pushed in, my alarm went off but no one entered the house, and when the detectives came they said, Well, you don't have any wrong, so they considered it a false alarm when, in fact, my neighbor, who was a Nassau policeman, saw the guy push the door in.

MR. WIENER:

With the sensors on windows and things, if you bang on the window, you're right, the alarm goes off.

LEG. MURATORE:

Exactly. So, you know, we're going to be collecting a lot of money for people who, in fact, didn't have a false alarm, but they did. Okay, thank you for your time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Wiener. And Legislator, I think I'm going to be pulling you in on my meetings *(laughter)*.

So the next speaker is Peter Fiorillo; and Rose Van Guilder, you will be after Peter. That's where you got the Peter from. Can we undo the rope, please? That might be helpful. Mr. Fiorillo is first. You're after him, Rose. Thank you. Just trying to give you all a head's up.

MR. FIORILLO:

Good morning. My name is Peter Fiorillo, I live in Nassau County. And I came in here totally unprepared. I came just to see what was going on. So, but I could probably speak for three days, like Mr. Smith.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You have three minutes *(laughter)*.

MR. FIORILLO:

Oh, I know. I was listening to Mr. Wiener and about the issue with the -- you know, with the fee. Well, I live in Nassau County, I pay \$100 every three years, and I'm happy to pay it. Because you know why? They come when my alarm goes off, the police come.

Several years ago, you had a Police Commissioner that went public in the paper that says with chronic alarms, *We're not coming anymore. We're just not going to even bother. We're going to ignore it.* What a nice thing to tell the burglars, because what the burglars do is they go to a location they want to burglarize and they sugar the oil; they kick the door, they do whatever, they wait for the police to come and then they come back and then they do it again until such time they know the cops aren't coming. Because they all have police scanners and when the cops aren't coming, that's what they do.

I got involved -- I've spoken to some of you people when they arrested my son-in-law. And by the way, when Mr. Bellone calls it a criminal enterprise, I don't often agree with him, but boy, did he misstate that one. How I got involved is -- how I got involved is that they framed my son-in-law, a Suffolk County cop, after he brought in a witness that was Jimmy Burke's neighbor and he was a serial criminal. And the honest police brought this guy Joe {Careshia} in and he gave them statements about the criminal enterprise that he was running, and they brought him to the DA's Office, and I have the paperwork. Three weeks after he was brought to the DA's Office, he was murdered right outside of a location on September the 24th, 2003 outside of Rob's Motel. It's a disgrace. This case is still unsolved to this day. But my story is long, I can go on forever about various other things.

The red light cameras? They could run it out of Suffolk County, they don't have to ship it out. They've got a perfectly good building right down the road that they call the Blue Star. They could set up over there and one of our people here was brought there, interrogated without benefit of a lawyer and was terrorized. And there's more of them, right at Blue Star. Why are they doing this? Is the District Attorney's Office not large enough to accommodate the people to interrogate them? What is going on in this County and why is this man getting away with it? I have called him a criminal. They know who I am, everybody knows who I am. I get -- but I can go on. Like I said, I'm unprepared. I'll start stuttering, I'll get all excited, I'll get red in the face and you're going to say, This guy's a nut. Oh, I got my three minutes up? Thank God, you saved me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

(Laughter).

(*Legislator Spencer entered the meeting at 10:35 A.M. *).

MR. FIORILLO:

Any time any of you folks want to sit down and talk with me, I'll bend your ears. And I've got the evidence. Thank you very much for hearing me.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Fiorillo. And Rose Van Guilder is next. And after that, after Rose is Vincent Rasulo.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good morning.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

I hope you all had a lovely day. Thank you. My first question is was this meeting on your agenda? Did everyone know about this meeting? If they did, why do we have so many missing Legislators?

Applause

LEG. HAHN:

This is a committee.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

We have as many Legislators missing as are present. I want to know, do we have a quorum?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ms. Van Guilder, I don't like to interrupt you and I'll give you a couple of seconds longer, because this is the Public Safety Committee meeting and the committee members are here. So yes, we do have a quorum.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Okay. Because we have seven Legislators missing. I --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, we don't. This is a committee.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

William Lindsay is missing, Thomas Barraga.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, this is not a General Meeting. This is a committee meeting.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's the Public Safety Committee members.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

I stand corrected, but I notice, I know all the Legislators.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I will provide you with a copy of the agenda and who the members are who are supposed to be here.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Not a problem.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Go ahead.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

I just wanted to bring it to everyone's attention. Okay. I would like to state that I've heard the testimony of many of the individuals here and I have to say that God is crying and weeping today. There is so much corruption and war, excuse me, ongoing in the world, in America or Albany, Suffolk and Nassau. It is time that we stopped working and thinking as Democrats and Republicans, and we need to work as Americans for the best interest --

Applause

-- of the people. People are dying in America, in the world. This is the only way that we can save lives and bring prosperity and happiness to the people. I ask that all the lawmakers cooperate.

Hillary Clinton, according to the Inspector General, failed to get legal approval for her private e-mails. This is abominable. How could the Secretary of State have done this? And yet she has the audacity to run for President of the United States.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If we could please hold the applause. Thank you.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

We have a Suffolk County District Attorney who there is surmounting evidence that he is not honorable and has dwarfed investigations.

(Timer Sounded)

What is the Suffolk County Legislature doing about this? Is he going to be removed from office? I would like an answer to that question.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

So would we all.

Applause

MS. VAN GUILDER:

We know this to be truthful.

Applause

We have a Red Light Camera Program that we know for a fact is illegal. We have had so much evidence come forward by many individuals here. We know that you were served with a subpoena to supply evidence of where the red light cameras are located. Have you done this? Have you provided this information to the judge? We want an answer.

Also, I received a notice from a collection company. I called that collection company and I told them I would sue them because this program is illegal and I will not pay the fee for the ticket that I received. You will all -- if you don't stop this program, I will sue the Suffolk County Legislature. That is a promise!

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mrs. Van Guilder.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

I also want to state --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Your time is up. Your time is up.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Yes. I just want to tell you, I am proud of the Suffolk County Police Commissioner, Tim Sini. He is doing a fabulous job.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mrs. Van Guilder.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

And I just want to tell you, I am doing fundraisers for our future President, Donald Trump.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mrs. Van Guilder.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

It will be at the Bourne Mansion and the --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I hit -- your time is up.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Oh, wait, wait.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Your time is up. I did give you extra time.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We have another speaker. Thank you. Mr. Vincent Rasulo.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Three minutes is not enough time.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Yeah, we want to be heard. Let the people speak.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Everyone is entitled to be heard, but when people applaud and the speaker is speaking, we can't hear what the speaker is saying.

So, could you please hold your applause so the speaker --

MR. PRESSMAN:

It's recorded.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- has the ability to be heard. Thank you.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

We need the applause. We need to applaud everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So can you go ahead and start? Mr. Rasulo, I apologize. Please go ahead.

MR. RASULO:

Thank you. Good morning. I am here to speak in support of Mr. Trotta's proposal to suspend the Red Light Camera Program. I attended a presentation by Mr. Gavilla and I found it fairly shocking the facts of this case. I take issue with the statement that was read before the public section that referred to people who have object to this program as violators. Truth be told, I got a red light camera ticket once, about four years ago. I wasn't aware of the requirement to stop for so many seconds beforehand. I have never gotten one since. I have never challenged a single traffic violation ticket I've ever gotten; when I'm guilty, I'm guilty.

I oppose this program because it's the wrong way to enforce these laws. I mean, you're outsourcing our policing to a private company for their windfall profits and I find it objectionable. And now you have \$33 million and where is that going? Where is that money going? We're talking about people who are getting billed for their alarm systems, we're talking about we don't have enough police officers to enforce these laws, yet you're raising millions of dollars with this program. That doesn't add up to me in my mind, so I would appreciate if you would maybe put this law enforcement back in the hands of the men who are supposed to do it and not in the hands of a private corporation who's profiting from it.

Applause

Thank you very much. I will yield back the rest of my time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next speaker is Michael McDermott. Michael McDermott?

MR. McDERMOTT:

I'm coming.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is he not in the room?

MR. McDERMOTT:

I'm right here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay. I apologize. Can you hold on a second?

MR. PRESSMAN:

You work for us.

MR. McDERMOTT:

It's okay, they didn't start the three minutes yet.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I apologize. Legislator Kennedy was asking a question, I had to clarify.

MR. McDERMOTT:

I apologize for not getting up here quickly enough.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I apologize, Mr. McDermott. Please go ahead.

MR. McDERMOTT:

I apologize for not getting up here quickly enough. I only have one leg and it takes me a little while to hop around.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No apologies needed.

MR. McDERMOTT:

My first thing I would like to say is, Ms. Browning, you really piss me off, and I'll tell you why.

Applause

I'm going to tell you why. Because when Mr. Trotta apologizes for these God damn red light cameras, you admonish him for speaking out of turn. And then you want to all talk about everything. What the hell's going on here?

Applause

I am really upset. I don't know when you're up for election, but I'm going to remember that. Because I'll tell you, I'm the Chairman of the Suffolk County Libertarian Party, and Libertarians are on the rise now because people are getting fed up with corruption and nonsense that you people make happen. It's unnecessary.

Anyway, now I'm going to start. My name is Michael McDermott. I ran for Governor in 2014 against Andrew Cuomo as a Libertarian. I was in a debate, so I'm a serious fellow. I didn't get as many votes as I would have liked because the two big parties think that that's the only way; well, it's not. I'm also the Chairman of the Suffolk County Libertarian Party, currently, and we're looking for people to run for office. I'm also an oath keeper, but I'm not here as that. An oath keeper, or have made an oath to not follow unconstitutional orders; former military, fireman and police that will not follow unconstitutional orders.

And let me say, Mr. Trotta, if you ever want to speak and you want to apologize for this horrendous program, don't listen to her. You say what you want to say because you deserve to be heard.

Applause

And I appreciate you putting up a program to get rid of these damn things. People have died. People here are serious, they're talking about really serious issues. And he tries to apologize and you don't let him; I really -- I'm sorry to be so pissed off, but you have pissed me off. But I'm here specifically to say that I am opposed to the Red Light Camera Program. It's unconstitutional, you can't face your accuser. There is no reason to have them except for money. And if you guys want to keep voting to keep the money flowing, there are other ways to do it. Reduce expenses. You guys cost us \$2 million a year in salaries; that's preposterous. And if you're going to cost us \$2 million, then do your job, watch out for the people. And you're not doing that.

And Steve Ruth was up here at the last meeting and Mr. Gregory told him he was out of order because he was calling for you guys to be arrested for the deaths of the people that have lost their lives.

LEG. D'AMARO:

He's out of order.

MR. McDERMOTT:

He's not out of order, we have three minutes. Three minutes, and I wasted a minute having to admonish you for being out of order yourself. So I'm against these red light cameras.

Now I understand that there's presentation to install new cameras for speed zones. What? Are you kidding me? Are you going to compound the problem and now have people -- you think it's going to stop anybody from speeding? I mean, you tried it in front of the schools and that didn't work and they had to be taken out. Listen, in summation, I just want to say we want to replace you people if you don't do your jobs.

Applause

And I am determined to spend a great deal of my life, on one leg or if I lost my second leg, to not stop until you guys are finished, because you better start doing your job.

(Timer Sounded)

Mr. Trotta, don't listen to them. You speak your mind. You deserve it, you're elected and I want to hear what you have to say. And if they want to applaud, they have every right to applaud. Thank you.

Cheers and Applause from Audience

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I didn't hear the last part with the noise. I'm asking for a proper decorum for the speakers, and if that speaker chooses to let you clap so I can't hear him properly, that's fine. And if anyone does have an interest, we do have a presentation. I think there's a lot of misinformation about what the dragon CAM is and if you want to stick around, listen to what it is, then maybe you'll be better enlightened. The next speaker is Susan Helleis. Hillis? I hope I did not destroy your name.

MS. HELLEIS:

Hi. Susan Helleis.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Helleis, sorry.

MS. HELLEIS:

I reside in Patchogue. I am against the program, the Red Light Program. I just want to speak briefly about my experience with the camera. I live in Patchogue and there's a camera on Route 112, Sunrise Highway intersection. I have experienced and witnessed many rear-ends there; not me personally, but very dangerous. Also, I myself got a red ticket, red light camera ticket. There was a disabled car in the right lane, it couldn't go, I went around it and the light was red, but I didn't stop for the right amount of time so I got the ticket. And to fight these tickets, it's ridiculous, you spend all day in traffic court.

Also, my daughter, she's a young driver, 19. She also was driving -- it was a rainy, icy kind of evening, she was so paranoid about the red light, going through the red light. She tried to stop, she couldn't stop, she skidded through the intersection. You can see when you have the video, her brake lights were on. Again, we tried to fight that one, it was all day in court, so we let it go. It's very dangerous and I wish there could be -- you know, there are extenuating circumstances to these things where you could -- it could be easier to explain your situation, but they make it very difficult. So that's all I have to say. I'd also like to thank Robert Trotta for all his work on this issue he's doing a great job. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And the next speaker is Chris Spilberg.

MS. SPILBERG:

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm here to support Legislator Muratore's bill in regards to Local Law amendment associated with servicing automatic fire extinguishing systems. I'm one of the Suffolk County licensed contractors who work on and service portable fire extinguisher systems and portable extinguishers. And throughout the years, we've had some restrictions in trade that the current law states that besides being licensed, that you have to be system certified by the original manufacturer to service and maintain. What Mr. Muratore's proposing is that we broaden that to allow third party training which here it is more an in-depth and actually gives you a hands-on lab training and more in-depth than what the original manufacturer gives you. Because through the original manufacturer's training, you're there because the the company is in a service contract and you automatically get the certificate. I have a letter here from my father who is -- who was a Brookhaven Fire Marshal serving in a supervising capacity for approximately 17 years, his total time there was 27 plus years. And we feel that it would be better to the industry to broaden this due to the fact that if they keep the restriction, not all of the restaurants throughout Suffolk County that require kitchen suppression systems will be serviced on a semi-annual basis in a six-month period. It's just approximately 25 to 30,000 throughout the whole County and there's just not enough personnel to service and keep these systems maintained and save. So I'm just here to support it. I know this has been tabled for June 1st, but I just want to say that I'm in support of this and I think it would be excellent thing if you guys approve this.

LEG. HAHN:

I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If you could stay there, Legislator Hahn has a question for you.

LEG. HAHN:

Hello. Thank you very much for being here today to speak on this. I -- Tom I had wanted to talk to you. I'm just curious, does the current law require that each technician be certified?

MR. SPILBERG:

No, it only requires that one person in the company, hence the way the law is written right now from the Suffolk County FELB, which is the Fire Extinguish Licensing Board, states that only one person in the company has to be certified. Now, that meets the burden of informal training with these third parties. And I know you -- I think you've had a chance to talk to Don House from All-Out Fire. It's a broader view. I've been to these trainings and it's not just an automatic certificate, you have to pass rigid examinations, it's hands on and it opens up to allow us as individual companies to service all the systems. Hence, back in the day some of the older companies have all these certificates. I've been in business approximately six years and the market is limited. I have -- out of the seven systems, I'm certified to install two and the other manufacturers, they don't even call you back to try and get the proper training.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, no -- I'm in agreement on the third party training. I think that that's an excellent idea. I'm just concerned that individuals that are doing the servicing don't have to take the training.

MR. SPILBERG:

Oh, I would be for that, that every single technician out there has to have -- besides being licensed by the County, has to have the third party certificate to service and maintain the automatic extinguisher systems.

LEG. HAHN:

So -- okay, thank you.

MR. SPILBERG:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Muratore has a question.

LEG. MURATORE:

Good morning, Mr. Spilberg. And thank you for taking the time to come down here. Do you have any idea how many systems, how many fire suppression systems we have here in Suffolk County?

MR. SPILBERG:

I service and maintain approximately 1,500 myself. I know one of my co-competitors out here --

LEG. MURATORE:

No, I want a total. Do you have an idea, an approximation?

MR. SPILBERG:

I would have to -- my guesstimate I would say is probably about 25, 30,000.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. And do we know how many individuals are licensed here in Suffolk County? I mean, I'm sure you can find out, but --

MR. SPILBERG:

I mean, licensed or licensed companies? Right now we have about 50, 60 licensed companies, but with the endorsement that that license company might only have the restriction of just servicing portable extinguishers. The companies that do the suppression systems have the second endorsement, because the County law written, you can't just service systems, you have to be able to service portable extinguishers. So the second endorsement probably drops it down to about approximately 25 companies. You know, but based on the intervals that are required by the National Fire Protection Association Standard 17 and Standard 17-A require that these systems are serviced and maintained every six months. And the way it is now -- I know for a fact that not all the systems are getting serviced out there, because there's just not enough manpower to do it the way the law is written right now.

LEG. MURATORE:

So in your professional opinion, you don't think there's enough qualified technicians to go out and service the 30,000 systems we have here in Suffolk County?

MR. SPILBERG:

No. And I know for a fact I stumble upon stuff that's been 18 to three years overdue sometimes, I've witnessed.

LEG. MURATORE:

But it seems like there's 20 special people here in Suffolk County that are --

MR. SPILBERG:

Well, 20 companies.

LEG. MURATORE:

Twenty companies.

MR. SPILBERG:

Yeah, some of them have four to five technicians in it.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. So if this bill is approved and we set this new system in place, we'll have more qualified technicians to go out and check these systems.

MR. SPILBERG:

Absolutely. And just I want to reiterate to you guys that this is just for servicing and maintaining. I am for keeping for installations that you have to be originally manufacturer certified. But this is for the service and maintenance.

LEG. MURATORE:

Mr. Spilberg, do you also -- are carbon monoxide systems included in this fire suppression?

MR. SPILBERG:

No, carbon monoxide, that's covered by the New York State Code and that's more that follows --

LEG. MURATORE:

So it's a separate company. It's a separate company, you don't do that in your company.

MR. SPILBERG:

No, I do. I am a licensed fire alarm vendor myself.

LEG. MURATORE:

Are most of the fire suppression system companies also licensed to do carbon monoxide?

MR. SPILBERG:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

No? Okay.

MR. SPILBERG:

It's a separate thing.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay, great. Again, thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And just so you know, the next meeting is in Riverhead, June 1st.

MR. SPILBERG:

Two PM, right?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And public hearing is at 6:30.

MR. SPILBERG:
6:30 P.M.?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
6:30 P.M., we have an evening meeting.

MR. SPILBERG:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
So if you can come to that meeting, there's a public hearing and it goes back to committee.

MR. SPILBERG:
Okay. We thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you. Next speaker is Anthony Varajao. Sorry. It's on the same issue, I know that.

MR. VARAJAO:
Hi. My name is is Anthony, I'm with All-Island Fire Protection. I have been servicing fire suppression systems for 40 years. It's always been a problem with the different jurisdictions with regard to what system you're certified in order to do an inspection.

LEG. MURATORE:
Speak into the the mic. I can't hear you.

MR. VARAJAO:
I'm sorry. Did you hear that? It's always been a problem with regard to what certifications you have with regard to inspecting the systems. I've always made it a point to go for third party certification so that I can service the systems when called upon. In Suffolk County you have a lot of jurisdictions, some enforce the fact that you have to be certified, most do not enforce the fact that you can inspect the system, but at any given time you're subject to a fine. I have employees that are not certified, I do take the time to train them. I will send them for third party certification, but that only enables them to do their job. A fine is a way of life in my business. I would like to see that third party certification so that everybody is professional in what they do and that they will be licensed accordingly, not just one individual in a company, because there are a lot of companies that won't take the time or spend the money to have them go to third party certifications.

The certification by the manufacturer will enable you to install the system, and that's what -- I can understand them insisting on that. But it's like telling me, I guess, the Maytag washing machine mechanic that he can't service a Kenmore, which really is silly, and a mechanic that can't work on more than one automobile. All of the parts for all of the manufacturers, all of the instruction manuals are available from third party sources. So I would like to see some change in the way things are done with regard to fire safety. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you. And I do apologize, I want to make a correction. The next meeting, June 1st, is here in Hauppauge. It's a morning meeting and the public hearing is at 2:30. I apologize. I think it's the meeting after that, correct?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Correct.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, that's in Riverhead. Next speaker is Stephen Ruth.

Applause

MR. RUTH JR:

Good morning, Committee Members and Legislators. I've been fighting this Red Light Camera Program for a long time now. I hope and pray that you see that the red light cameras are a detriment to Suffolk County and that the risks and damages to the well-being of the Suffolk County residents far outweigh the benefits. We all know now that red light cameras are a systematic form of extortion and nothing more. Never before have we seen civil disobedience on this scale, with more than 30% of tickets having gone delinquent and unpaid resulting in judgments placed upon the residents of Suffolk County who have never had a more difficult time to survive and pay their bills with rising taxes, inflation, utilities, insurance and cost of living.

The Red Light Camera Program jeopardizes the financial stability and well-being of so many Suffolk County residents and still does to this day, as threats are being made by Paul Margiotta that the Suffolk County -- that Suffolk County will be seizing cars, garnishing salaries and seizing bank accounts when none of the cameras were even signed off by engineers, nor were the traffic signals; due to liability issues, of course. The traffic signals were manipulated for revenue and was all made possible by Suffolk County's reckless willingness to do anything for money. Traffic tickets should be given by bonded law enforcement officers only, not by cameras. There also needs to be a uniform yellow light time; that law should be call John Luke's Law. Each intersection should not have different yellow light times. Many people have been injured and killed because of this.

I believe that what -- I believe in what I'm fighting for and I have put my freedom on the line to expose the systematic form of extortion just for revenue in Suffolk County. Please put this bill before the Legislature to be voted upon on June 1st. I thank you kindly for your consideration.

Also, I do have a question, while we have members of the Public Works or Safety Committee here. I want to ask if there are any engineers signing off on the cameras, I would like to know who they are. Because there's no engineer signatures on the signal plans which determine when the traffic lights were changed or worked on, and there's also no signatures for any times that the cameras were inspected and signed off by engineers. I'd like to know where those signatures are.

(Brief Pause)

We do have people here, I believe, from the Public Works Committee.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

This is not the time for them to ask you -- answer your questions. When we get to the bill, we'll be having them up.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Yes, it is!

MR. RUTH JR:

Well, I think that I still have 40 seconds and I'm definitely curious to know why we have no cameras signed off by engineers, but you guys are so curious as to whether or not fire systems were signed off by engineers or get inspected by engineers. We want to -- or need to be licensed.

Applause

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

I need to know who signs off on these cameras. There's no engineers signing off on the cameras or the traffic signals in the County. That's not fair. That's not right for the residents. That's safety being thrown out the window for revenue. We need to know why engineers are not signing off on our traffic signals or the cameras and why you're not concerned with this.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Next speaker is Stephen --

MR. RUTH JR:

It has everything to do with liability.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The next speaker --

MR. RUTH JR:

You guys know about that. It has to do with the County not wanting to recognize liability for any of their actions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Stephen Ruth Sr is the next speaker.

Applause

Okay, I guess because of all the noise, the person did not hear his name; Stephen Ruth Sr. Go ahead, Mr. Ruth.

MR. RUTH:

Good morning, Legislators. This is the third time I have taken time to let you know my feelings in reference to the Red Light Camera Program. I am taking the time from my job to voice my opinion. I am not being paid for my efforts here. I have been listening to many others with the same complaints. I have witnessed a lackluster attitude by you in regard to these meetings. I get a feeling you are only here and going through the motions, not listening to what is being said. If you were asked what was said, could you give a reasonable answer?

What is the purpose of this meeting; to decide whether or not you are going to remove the red light cameras or to decide whether or not to discuss it? It's all a stall. The cash is still flowing. Continue to blow this off. Accidents, injury and deaths caused by this program are under no circumstances justified. It has been proven by the statistics that the camera program has caused all of these.

(*Legislator Lindsay entered the meeting at 11:06 A.M. *)

Information surrounding each and every aspect of this program has been hard to find. The timing of the lights has been blown off as not important. The extra fee charged by the County has been again blown off. How can we trust our Legislators to work for the public good when their motivations are questionable? I'm not going to point fingers and accuse anyone of crimes, I'm not going to ask what happened to the money. I'm going to ask you to do your job. Remove these cameras that are a public death threat.

Let me say this; statistics are working against all of us. It's a matter of time before you or one of your family members is touched by the Red Light Camera Program; not the ticket, but the accident, injury or death. You have it in your power to end this safety money grab and turn it into a safety

program. Don't waste more of our time. Election Day is coming.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Ruth.

The next speaker is -- I apologize, I cannot read the last name. The first name is Tara. Tara from Selden. Okay, thank you. For the record, if you would state your full name. Thank you.

MS. GARCED:

My name is Tara Garced. I am against the red light camera district -- the red light cameras. I applaud Mr. Trotta and I am a hundred percent behind Mr. Ruth, because he absolutely made me be aware and it woke me up to what was going on, because I received them.

As I sit and I watch each and everybody's face, sometimes you look like you're speaking amongst yourselves. Well, I have a 19-year-old daughter who got a red light ticket, who was forced into an intersection when she attempted to stop, at an intersection that was duly noted 42% rear-end increase. She did what she was supposed to do. She got caught under the three seconds. I took her to court to fight the ticket. You know what I was told by the judge? *We don't discuss three minutes or three seconds, it's not our job. It's not my job.* We don't discuss the fact that due process was taken away. So when did any one of you get the judicial authority to take away due process? Because if an officer issues a summons, he has to show up in court, because each and every one of us have the right to face our accuser.

Applause

But that's not said. You know what I was told? *If you don't like it, take it up with the legislation.* So guess where I ended up? In Mr. Trotta's office, and now I'm here to face you. Because I'm not going to have my daughter killed because she was forced into an intersection because you people decided to put it on the table and think about it.

You know, I got a \$105 lien placed against my house that I just bought from a red light camera, and when I went to fight it they told me that there were -- that I was served a lien on my house for a red light camera that should never have been put in place. Nothing good has come of it. So when I go to fight it, they tell me, We issued you -- *we served you eight times.* They served somebody named Tara who lived in Farmingdale, eight times. But yet you stood by the lien that were put on my house when you never even served me. So you're going to stand here and justify, once again, the red light camera, but we all know that it's nothing but revenue. Twenty-eight percent vote for the pay increase of Suffolk County, but you couldn't afford it. The County couldn't afford it, but you voted it in anyway and piggybacked it on the red light camera, so you thought that all of the sheep out here were not going to notice. But you know what? I was one of those sheep, until Mr. Ruth opened up my eyes, and now I'm awake. And now I'm not going to sit here and listen to the BS every time it comes across because you don't want to hear it.

(Timer Sounded)

So I really do hope that you put it across and you vote the cameras down. Take them away because they're not helping. Thanks.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And I -- your Legislator is in the room. I will make sure -- I think you do have some things that need to be addressed. Legislator Muratore, this is -- it's your constituent, I'll pass off your information.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next speaker is Marie Tooker.

MS. TOOKER:

Good morning, everybody. I just want to talk about the last meeting. Mr. Gregory stated that the last meeting, when He stopped me from speaking, something very important. He said it was *not a game show*. Well, guess what, everybody; it's definitely a game show. It's your show and it's called *Beat the Clock*. And it's also called, you know the game when we were kids, *Red light, green light, 1-2-3*; that's the other game. But guess what? Even Newsday says, "*It's showdown. It's a showdown.*" Well, guess what. The show and the game is now over, because we the people, we want to be heard. We want a stop to all these problems --

Applause

-- that you guys have that you have neglected to take care of. The drugs, elderly abuse. Maude Pollack; thank you, Mrs. Fleming, for not helping her with elderly abuse. Friday, tomorrow, she might be homeless. Thank you for not helping. Gun violence, gun violence, the red light cameras, zombie homes, corruption, homelessness; all major issues unresolved. Now I'm going to say my speech again, hopefully you're going to give me the time. I have Maude Pollack here, I'm going to take her three minutes, if you don't mind.

My name is Marie Gareer Tooker, a victim and a whistle blower that is horrifically being injured by the Suffolk crime family. Yes, Mr. Bellone, you are correct, it is a criminal enterprise. But it is not just Rico, it's called the Hobbs Act. This criminal enterprise involves four Police Departments, three towns, Suffolk County agencies including the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, and most importantly, the judiciary. Many judges assisted the enterprise to give private actors my property through armed robbery, extortion, bribery, threats and fear of my life and my children and the torture of over 60 animals contumacious (*sic*) the Hobbs Act. Why did not the DA prosecute? Why? Because his buddy, Mr. Prudenti, is protecting the criminals. Mostly people with powerful positions including John Scott, his sister AnnMarie Prudenti and their cousin Gail Prudenti have misused their power and destroyed many lives. We've heard of many here today, haven't we? They sat back and watched our animals being tortured and prosecuted me instead of prosecuting their buddy, David Reilly and convicted felons who murdered my animals. And what do the people do? They give him a bone and they make him a Judge; Judge David Reilly.

(Timer Sounded)

Abbotts Farm was preserved by Suffolk County. This farm was earmarked for the good of humanity to give under privileged children a chance to thrive in society with equal opportunity to complete -- to compete with the privileged selected few children. Public officials are so jealous they stopped every move I made to steal this wonderful farm and destroyed endless opportunities for our youth and homeless veterans.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, your time is up.

MS. TOOKER:

Okay. I'm taking her three minutes now.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, the rules do not allow you to --

MS. TOOKER:

Okay. Well, Maude's going to finish the story. Come on.

MS. POLLACK:

What am I doing?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, Maude is next, she's more than welcome to speak.

MS. TOOKER:

I'm going to speak for Maude because she's sick, okay? So I'm taking her three minutes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm sorry, she's here, she can --

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

She's representing her.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

She has to speak. She signed a card to speak. If you wouldn't mind, please step away so Maude can speak.

MS. TOOKER:

Who wants me to speak for Maude.

Applause.

MS. TOOKER:

Everybody stand up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm sorry, the rules do not permit --

MS. TOOKER:

She's 93 years old and we need to speak for her.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The rules do not permit you to take her time. She has -- she is standing there next to you for the past three minutes, she is more than welcome to step forward and speak.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

We want to hear what --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sheriff? Ms. Tooker, if you would please move away and let Maude speak?

MS. TOOKER:

Maude cannot speak right now, I'm speaking on her behalf.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Maude can speak, she came to a previous meeting and spoke.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

She can barely see.

MS. TOOKER:

Okay, right here. Get your glasses.

MS. POLLACK:

Okay.

MS. TOOKER:

Beat the clock, everybody. Here we go, one, two, three, ring the bell, please.

MS. POLLACK:

It says my name is --

MS. TOOKER:

No, no, right here. See what I mean?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Shame on you, Browning!

MS. TOOKER:

It's okay.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Shame on you all!

MS. POLLACK:

Suffolk County officials --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And Legislator Trotta is asking me to make sure we start the clock also.

MS. TOOKER:

Start the clock, hurry up.

MS. POLLACK:

-- of the conspiracy to destroy constitutionally God-given rights of the people like me who expose their wrongdoings of corruption. Epidemics of a criminal activity by people in power, long overdue for an investigation, office policing, corruption, it has joined millions of families across America. Nepotism, cronyism and the building --

MS. TOOKER:

Bullying.

MS. POLLACK:

Bullying by public officials is a systematic epidemic intertwined with private actors has poisoned our government beyond another committee in the new office --

MS. TOOKER:

Or a new office.

MS. POLLACK:

Or a new office. The last thing residents need is a new government office to watch their corrupt good ole' boys club. We the people need the fourth branch of government which is our constitutional right. We are back where we started when the Legislative body stripped the Fifth Amendment from the people to have a Grand Jury to go before without being tainted by prosecutors or judges. We can see now why our Forefathers in their place --

MS. TOOKER:

Put this in place.

MS. POLLACK:

Look at the mess Suffolk County (*laughter*) -- boy, oh, boy.

MS. TOOKER:

(*Laughter*). Game all right. You want a game? You got one.

MS. POLLACK:

People leaving the middle class with a little means to thrive, the poor become homeless --

MS. TOOKER:

And hungry.

MS. POLLACK:

And hungry.

MS. TOOKER:

Drugs and alcohol are destroying our families and the political forces assisting it right here in Riverhead.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ms. Tooker, this is Maude's opportunity --

MS. TOOKER:

Investigation into the Suffolk County crime family is simple.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ms. Tooker, this is Maude's time to speak and she's doing a fine job. I will allow her the time to speak.

MS. TOOKER:

All the evidence you need prove corruption --

MS. POLLACK:

All the evidence you need to prove corruption --

MS. TOOKER:

-- is in the County Center court records.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You will have to move away. This is Maude's time to speak, please be respectful of her.

MS. TOOKER:

Be quiet, Ms. Browning. You're annoying everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Deputy Sheriff, could you please help us, please?

MS. TOOKER:

Project numbers -- go ahead.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

We want to hear it.

MS. TOOKER:

Index and docket numbers --

MS. POLLACK:

Index and -- I can't if you repeat it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Maude.

*(*Deputy Sheriffs approached Ms. Tooker*)*

(Boos From Audience)

DEPUTY SHERIFF:

This way, Ma'am.

MS. TOOKER:

I'm assisting an elderly, sir.

DEPUTY SHERIFF:

Ma'am?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Deputy, could you also --

MS. POLLACK:

Can I finish it?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, we'll stop the clock for Maude.

MS. TOOKER:

Thank you.

MS. POLLACK:

Evidence to prove that corruption, index and docket number all in -- you need to start funding.

MS. TOOKER:

This needs to happen by every day common --

MS. POLLACK:

This needs to happen by every day common people to establish a common Grand Law, Grand Jury so that it's bomb proof of the Suffolk County crime family. Drawn upon the court systemic crisis is our justice system. We do not need another officer run by some local government, we need is a fourth branch of government.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Maude, your time is almost up.

MS. POLLACK:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I do applaud you.

MS. POLLACK:

John Scott Prudenti, Steve Bellone and many others need to do more than resign, they need to become whistle blowers, get them to tell their sentencing when they are convicted of one of the most horrific crimes, the Hobbs Act. Our justice system in both civil and criminal are slowly killing people from trauma, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and law abuse that many are turning to drugs, alcohol and even suicide. To me, this is murder. Showdown --

MS. TOOKER:

A slow down.

MS. POLLACK:

A slow down of torture that has been visible to the eye.

MS. TOOKER:

It's not visible to the eye.

MS. POLLACK:

Anyone who was kidnapped and dragged from the scenes --

MS. TOOKER:

Into the arena. Into the arena of the justice court system can understand --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MS. POLLACK:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I have extended your time and your time is up.

MS. POLLACK:

Anyone can drag --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Maude?

MS. POLLACK:

-- into an area. The justice court system can understand with the grace of God how many people are going to come forth and tell their stories to the corruption they experience as soon as we will have a serious abundance of wrongdoing and empower to Suffolk County.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Maude. Thank you.

Applause

MS. POLLACK:

Thank you.

MS. TOOKER:

I hope you guys got this on the news. Time to show the truth, everybody!

(*Ms. Tooker was escorted out of the auditorium by Deputy Sheriffs*)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And the next speaker is Linda Frego. Linda Frego? And the next speaker is Ron Bracci after Ms. Frego.

MS. FREGO:

First I would like to say I'm proud of we the people for standing up for our County against the corruption.

Applause

As you may or may not know, I'm a veteran of the New York Army National Guard and I've been on several missions over the years and one of my missions was to protect the State of New York and Grand Central Station and Penn Station, as well as JFK. As you know, I've told you before that the Red Light Camera Program is unconstitutional and it should not be going on any longer, it should have been put to a stop months ago. I have been to court for a red light camera ticket years ago before Xerox took over, and when I went to court, there was a man who came in before me, as I've stated. The man talked to the judge and he cited Bullcoming v. New Mexico and Crawford v. Washington, the judge said, *This is quasi-criminal. Red light camera tickets are quasi-criminal. You have the right to confront your accuser.* And I'm sorry, the red light cameras cannot accuse you, only a police officer has the right to accuse you.

Applause

So if you weren't aware before when I told you the last time, it is unconstitutional and so are the speed cameras. So please, I pray to God you do not put them in because they are unconstitutional. We can't confront them.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

I probably will be receiving a red light camera in the mail, one or two. I had gone to a funeral not too long ago of a good friend of mine, and during the funeral procession it happened that I had to have gone through a red light. But according to local custom, people are to give the right-of-way to people in a funeral procession; red light cameras cannot distinguish that. So I am proud to say I will not be paying that and I will be lining the kitty litter box with the red light camera tickets that I'm expecting.

And also you've said that this is for the safety of the children. This is not for the safety of the children; children have been killed. You have been told this. No one is safe; senior citizens, the poor children. You cannot sit up here and say this is for safety because it is not and you know this. Are you going to wait until your child gets hit by a car because they were looking at the flash or they were nervous about the sign? I know I don't want my child getting hit by a car because of this. And I have served you people and I expect you to serve me and serve we the people. You want to put speed cams up and red light cameras? Our answer is no. The only cameras that should be put up are body cam cameras on you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The next speaker is Ron Bracci. Next speaker, Ron Bracci; and after that is Charles Clampett.

MR. BRACCO:

Hello, everyone. My name is Ron Bracco and I'm from Melville. My comments this morning will be brief because I've spoken here several times already and I think I've covered everything I need to say, but I do have a few additional things I would like to add.

First of all, it's quite obvious by now that the cameras are not there for safety, that they're there just about revenue generation. They're obviously a scam. I've heard that the figure is 32 million has been collected by these cameras so far. Obviously you're doing this because you need money. You need money to pay expenses or whatever, to just generate revenue for your budget. My idea for you is why not just spend less money? Why not just look at ways to cut costs rather than looking at ways to tax people additional money such as the red light cameras and the alarm, which we know is just another tax, the alarm bill. Why not just look for ways to reduce money? I'm sure if you drove around and had an open mind, drove around Suffolk County, you could find probably a hundred ways that money is being wasted.

So what we need in Suffolk County and what we need throughout America really is we need smaller government, not larger government. We need less taxes, not more. We need more freedom, not less. You should be figuring out ways to increase our freedom, not take it away.

You know what? Corruption can end with you. We all know that the Federal government in this country is beyond corrupt, we all know that; and if you don't, you're diluting yourself or you're quite naive. We all know that the State government is corrupt; if you don't know that, you're naive. And we know that the Suffolk County government on the higher level is beyond corrupt as well. You people can do something at the ground roots level and say, you know what? We're going to make Suffolk a great place to live. We're going to make it so that people don't want to leave Suffolk County, they want to live here and that it's known throughout America as a great place to live. And you can do that by reducing government and increasing freedom and lowering taxes, not raising them.

Instead of trumping up charges against people like Stephen Ruth, and I know you don't do that personally, but the Suffolk County court system is trumping up all these charges against people like Stephen Ruth. Why not open your minds a little bit and listen to what he has to say? Because

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

apparently there are many people that believe just as he does and would like to see Suffolk County become a better place, would like to see it become a place of freedom. So I thank you for your time. If anyone has any questions, that would be fine as well. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

Applause

Next is Charles Clampett, and following that is Mohammed Siagha.

MR. CLAMPET:

(Knocked on podium). Hello? Anybody in the County Legislature listening? Anybody looking up when people are up here speaking, or are you playing with your computer and you're playing with your phone and text messaging each other and doing whatever, okay. Do I have your attention? Okay.

Corruption starts with Suffolk County PBA which sits in the back.

The FBI must investigate the Suffolk County PBA. Why isn't the Suffolk County Legislature afraid of the Suffolk County PBA? Why is the State Senator and Assembly afraid of the Suffolk County PBA? Why every time there is a Suffolk County Legislative meeting the Suffolk County PBA is here? Oh, that's great. It is to find out how much money they can squeeze out of the constituents, squeeze out of the constituents. \$250,000 for Mr. Corwin for his crossing duck farm. Now the PBA might find another way to squeeze and scam money out of the taxpayers.

Did you read the contract for the red light program? Did you read the contract? And now Bellone wants to create another job? Oh, now he stops, he's not going to create that job because now the FBI's watching everyone.

You know, you talk about people, alarm tax, park fees tax, registration tax. Suffolk County gets \$40 every two years from my car. You want people to move here? You keep taxing them, they're going to move out, they're not going to stay here. Stony Brook, it's considered steering. When you go to real estate offices, it's called steering. You can tell people, Don't move in Kate Browning's area because that's Mastic/Shirley area. Don't move into this area, this is a bad area. That's exactly what Stony Brook Hospital did. If you looked on that video, they put up the red zone. It's so horrible here that people are dying because of the red light camera. Don't you see that? Look at that tape. You talk about you can't hear people? There's a lady right here, she's typing everything that I say, everything that everybody else said. So why don't you listen to her? That's where you get your information from, Ms. Browning.

Talk about safety? 500 police officers are short in Suffolk County. Now you want to put the speed camera. Outsourcing jobs? We talk about not doing outsourcing jobs, and that's what you're doing, you're outsourcing jobs. Having these clowns come in to Suffolk County and take more money from the people. Like Warner Wolf said, Ms. Kate Browning, go to the video tape, and I say go to the audio tape and go to the minutes of the legislation meeting if you can't understand what people are saying when people are clapping. When running -- when running for office, your palm cards never said anything about a red light program to be installed. Constituents should be able to vote about the red light camera and also about the speed camera.

Applause

No, we're not able to do that. Democrats are screwing up the County 110%. Make people want to stay in Suffolk County, not move out.

Thank you for your lousy time because none of you's care. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Next speaker is Mohammed Singha.

MR. CLAMPET:

And I hope I was clear, Ms. Browning. I hope I was clear, Ms. Browning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Your time is up. Mr. Singha, please.

MR. CLAMPET:

Yeah.

MR. NOLAN:

Knock it off.

MR. CLAMPET:

You're like a worm, you're hiding in the ground right now.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Singha?

MR. CLAMPET:

Have a nice day.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Take that to Mr. Walsh, your friend.

MR. SINGHA:

Good afternoon.

MR. CLAMPET:

Pardon, Ms. Browning?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You don't need to say that.

MR. CLAMPET:

Pardon, Ms. Browning? What did you say? You work for us, man. You work for us!

MR. NOLAN:

Knock it off.

MR. CLAMPET:

You work for us! And so do you, Mr. Calarco.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm sorry, Mr. Singha.

MR. CLAMPET:

And so do you, Bill Lindsay. You work for us.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I know who I work for, Charles. Who do you work for?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You've got a lot of nerve.

MR. CLAMPET:

Who do I work for, Bill Lindsay? He just asked me a question.

Who I do I work for.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Who do you work for?

MR. CLAMPET:

Myself. I'm not here for any party. When you're an elected official, you're no longer a Democrat. You work for the constituents.

LEG. LINDSAY:

That's what I'm doing now.

MR. CLAMPET:

Yeah, along with the PBA. Along with the PBA. You're not taking care of the Sheriff's Department, but yet you want them to escort us out of here.

Applause

(*Mr. Clampet was escorted out of the auditorium by Deputy Sheriffs*)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Singha.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm not on this committee, so I'm here as a courtesy to listen to you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Bill? Bill? We have a couple of presentations yet to go. Mr. Singha, I apologize. Please go ahead.

MR. SIAGHA:

Thank you. My name is Mohammed Siagha. I've been volunteering in my community for over two decades, helping troubled teens, immigrants, and I just -- I'm here today because many of them are frightened to come out. They believe this is part of some organized conspiracy. In my community, people are afraid to speak up. My parents came here, they did the best that they could and they're also afraid to speak up. My father has never committed a crime, worked one job his whole life, retired, relaxed. And when we come to something like this, you really haven't seen the sleeping giant wake up on Long Island. We are organizing. We're organizing, we're preparing to campaign. *(Brief pause)*. I'm a little bit nervous.

You know, even myself, being raised here, I'm also frightened and silenced to speaking up. Been investigated many times for many different things. I'm not a terrorist, I'm a truth teller, and sometimes when you tell the truth, people come looking for you. You don't know too much about

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

me, but you should do a little research. We spread a lot of information to a lot of people, we're trying to educate people. It's hard to control the youth and tell them to do the right things when the people that are elected are not doing the right things. When we don't know better, we can't do better.

Applause

But when we do know better, we should do better. I'm licensed by the State of New York. I took an oath to protect family, friends and community. I took the oath before I was -- before I took a license, so I'm here with family and friends from all over Long Island. We're not going to go away, we're here. He put something beautiful on the table; why can't we have a countdown? That's good for taxpayers and residents. Why can't we do something right away that will improve it? Why is there so much that we can't improve? Just have a little faith, show the people, the taxpayers, just show them, *Look, we're going to work with you.* It's reasonable, that's reasonable. A \$30 surcharge? It hurts a lot of people in my community, the small businesses. Most of the people that I talk to every day work 30 hours, 32 hours a week. They don't even have full-time jobs on Long Island anymore. And it hurts small businesses.

Just take into consideration. You know, he's right, let's create jobs, let's do things that will spend money that you can get taxes, not just take away the money because you've got to pay a surcharge, you can't buy milk, bread. This is a fact in my community; I'm Brentwood, Central Islip, Bay Shore. And I'm here to let you know it's hurting people. You're hurting people. Let's do something better, we can. The same way we got creative to get these red lights, I'm sure we could come up with a creative plan, a brilliant plan, and show everybody. We're trending on Long Island. The Commissioner's arrested, the Sergeant was robbing immigrants. I mean, let's be real, there's a lot of things going on. We're trending on Long Island for corruption; it's terrible.

(Timer Sounded)

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, hold on a minute. Actually, Legislator Martinez is your Legislator, she'd like to ask you a question.

MR. SIAGHA:

Hi. How are you?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Good after -- well, almost good afternoon. Siagha is it?

MR. SIAGHA:

Yes, it is.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Mr. Siagha, I do notice that you are from Central Islip and you are my constituent. I would actually like to speak to you. I'm surprised that you've come here and you have never reached out to me. So I would really like for you -- I guess I should say this in a question format. But would you call my office and make an appointment so you and I can speak? Because you have raised a couple of issues just now which I would like to address with you one-on-one, and with anyone else that you may have in the community, and let's see how we can work together on a myriad of issues. But I do appreciate you being here. But at the same time, as your Legislator, and you are my constituent, I

would actually like to have a relationship with you and see what's going on and how I can help you.

MR. SIAGHA:

I just want to say thank you for the invitation. You know, I've been involved in a lot of projects in the community, I'm sure you've seen me, I've seen you plenty of times. I don't -- you know, a lot of times I don't go to the Legislature, I don't go anywhere because I -- I was a troubled teen and, you know -- but I'm willing to go out and speak with you. And like I said, you know, in the streets we have a code, do for self, and that's what we're teaching the kids, you know, because -- I'll get in touch with you. I'll get in touch with you.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Thank you. And that's something we don't want to teach our kids. We want to teach our kids, you know, we want to make sure -- Mr. Siagha, I'm speaking. We want to teach our kids that they should not fear, you know, and there shouldn't be any codes on the street. Because one of the things I'm trying to do is change that in our district and change that in our community. And we can't have the opposition going against, and that is why -- question. That is why, would you like to discuss how we can better our community, you know, working together?

MR. SIAGHA:

I apologize for walking away. But like I said, you know, I'm here just to voice the opinion of many, many -- hundreds of thousands of immigrants who are afraid, and even myself. You know, I don't like to be public, but even coming here in front of everybody and speaking the truth even makes me move. So I will be meeting with you. Thank you, everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next speaker is Sarah Lynne Fogelstrom. And the last speaker after that is Rachel Lugo.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

Good morning. My name is Sarah Fogelstrom, I'm here to support Rob Trotta's bill against the unconstitutional red light camera scam and implore you all to do the same.

I had a little shorter piece to say, but after sitting here, the longer I listen to my neighbors with the same complaints and I watch and I listen to some of you Legislators seemingly uninterested and with your stoic faces, I get even more angry. How sad is it that someone like Stephen Ruth has to intervene in the cameras and put his freedom on the line to get you to take notice. I was here several months ago regarding an accident my son had involving a red light camera. The short story is he was going straight on Route 111 at a red light going about ten miles an hour. An 18-wheeler came barreling off of Exit 56 and caused a three-car pile-up; the guy left the scene of the accident, there was no tickets given. None of the three-car drivers were considered at fault. The drivers were so flustered they did not get his driver's license number and -- so we all contacted our insurance companies and our insurance companies told us that they were told they were not entitled to view the red light camera footage. Okay, if I pay for that camera footage in my taxes, why am I not entitled to it when my son is involved in a \$2,000 car accident? He wasn't injured, thank God, but there are many others that have been. There are people that have been killed. Why am I not entitled to that footage; does anyone have an answer?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Good point.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

My insurance company took two months to try and get that camera footage to find out who that driver was.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I can respond.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Why don't we wait?

MS. FOGELSTROM:

They told me the only way we would be entitled to get that camera footage was if there was a citation given. Being that the guy that caused the accident, left the scene of the accident, no citation was given, so no insurance company and no person was allowed the camera footage, so I ended up paying a deductible that I shouldn't have had to pay. And I'm assuming the guy in the middle had a car that was totaled, okay? This is not right. I'm paying for those cameras. I just don't understand it. How dare anybody tell me, when my son is involved in an accident, that we are not entitled to see who the driver of that 18-wheeler was. Why would you not want to catch him and give him a citation or take away his driver's license? We don't even know if we went through a red light, a green light, a yellow light.

I sent a letter to all the Legislators, the only ones to respond were Tom Cilmi and Legislator Kennedy; thank you. The rest of you cannot take the time to even have your secretaries send me a response. We have the highest paid Police Department in the country. How many of them are on desk jobs?

(Timer Sounded)

How about giving those desk jobs to civilians and put the cops back on the road and let them deal with the driving? This way we can face our accusers if you do something wrong. I've slammed my foot on the brakes with a car -- with ice on the road so that I wouldn't go through and get a ticket. I'm almost done. My husband and I grew up on Long Island, we raised three children here. I'm angry, as you can see. These abusive fees for these scams coupled with our property taxes, our high heating and electric rates, now a possible fee for water, another scam tacked on by Bellone, are making it extremely impossible for our children to stay on Long Island, making it difficult for even me to stay on Long Island. Where does it end? When you stop stealing from our wallets. We pay your salaries. If things don't change, I will either move out or make it my job to make sure that every one of you that are supporting this nonsense is voted out.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. Mrs. Fogelstrom, Legislator -- it's either Legislator Kennedy or Cilmi is your Legislator, so.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

Tom Cilmi is my Legislator.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So he has reached out you?

MS. FOGELSTROM:

He has reached out to me and I appreciate the help that he has given me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

But like I said, I sent a letter to every one of you. They are the only two that responded.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But your Legislator reached out to you, which is the appropriate thing to do. Thank you.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

It doesn't matter, everyone should.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Next speaker is --

MS. FOGELSTROM:

You all work for me.

LEG. MURATORE:

Question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tom, you have a question?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes, I do. Can you come back, please? I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ms. Fogelstrom, please come back. Legislator Muratore has a question.

LEG. MURATORE:

Over this way, over here. You said you sent it to all 18 Legislators?

MS. FOGELSTROM:

I sent the same e-mail to every single one of you. There was one other woman who I don't even -- I don't see her name here, she responded with a letter saying she was sorry for my son's accident.

LEG. FLEMING:

(Raised her hand).

MS. FOGELSTROM:

But other than that, Tom Cilmi and Legislator Kennedy were the only ones that answered my e-mail. I got nothing -- I got a written letter from the other lady, I don't recall --

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. I was just curious if you sent it to all 18 of us.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

I sent it to all 18.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay, thank you.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

And you all work for me, so even if you weren't going to give me help, you should have responded to me.

Applause

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, we know that, we know that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:

That's why we're here and we're letting you abuse us this way. We have no problem with it. You know, we want you to speak. We want you to tell us your problems. The only question is --

MS. FOGELSTROM:

I'm abusing you, did you just say?

LEG. MURATORE:

No, no, not you, I didn't say you. Other people have. I didn't say you.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

Okay.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. You have to listen, please. Okay?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Next --

LEG. MURATORE:

My question was I want to make sure we all got it, that's all.

LEG. TROTTA:

What's your -- I just want to check and make sure I got it. What's your e-mail address?

MS. FOGELSTROM:

Dizymeup@optonline.net. Now the whole --

LEG. TROTTA:

Just give me the first four letters.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

D-I-Z-Y.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

When did you send that e-mail?

MS. FOGELSTROM:

A couple of weeks ago.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I'll check my e-mails and see if you sent me them.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Check the one I sent you, too.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. The next one -- next speaker is Rachel Luco. Lugo.

MS. LUGO:

Good afternoon and thank you. Many of you know I have been working in the traffic safety field for approximately 20 years. I have spent my entire career focusing on saving lives and preventing injuries. I also grew up in Suffolk County, I have lived here for 45 years, my entire life. Thirty-five of those years I spent living in a household, listening to pagers and radios go off with signal 16s responding to these motor vehicle crashes that are occurring on our roadways. I know there are a lot of opposition to this issue. I ask how many people in this room respond to these calls, respond to the signal 16s that they hear on the radio? I see the accidents, I hear about it when my parents used to come home at night. The community, there are problems, there are issues, I understand that. And all these issues, accidents and crashes are steadily increasing in our community, over 35 years, not just the past couple of years because of these red light cameras.

I have spent my entire career raising the awareness of traffic safety and it's putting safety first for motorists, pedestrians and the surrounding communities as a whole. I am agreeing with you that the number of crashes have growing, but so have the newly licensed drivers as well as technology in our vehicles. Texting behind the wheel, distracted driving, drug driving, drinking and driving; these are all factors that occur, that have impact on these crashes. It's backed up by data. Look, the New York State Institute of Traffic Safety Management, the data is there; listen to it, read it. I get it, there are problems. Maybe the calibration of these cameras, maybe there are some issues we need to look into, I understand that.

You have to understand that motor vehicle crashes are the number one killer of teenagers. Combined with inexperience, more and more teens are increasingly injured or killed. Did you know that a recent survey was conducted in Suffolk County and Suffolk County has the lowest percentage of seat belt use in the entire State of New York, for years. Which means what? We're not buckling up, we're projectiles; we're coming out of the vehicle, we are getting killed.

You can't sit here today and say that motor vehicle crashes and injuries and deaths are increasing because of red light cameras. What about stop signs? Let's take them away also. They're revenue generating. Come on, think about it. Red lights, why not just take away every single red light there is, every single light and just put stop signs in a community? If you want to focus, focus your attention on issues such as vehicle safety, seat belts, a universal seat belt law in Suffolk County. There is not a universal seat belt law in New York State. We are working actively with the Senate, with the majority, we are trying with the Transportation Committee. Yes, we have some problems Upstate, I've been through this. We can't even get a law passed that's protecting people from being in a back seat of a vehicle. Adults don't have to wear their seatbelts. And look what happened to Bob Simon, he's not with us anymore. Why? Forty-five mile an hour crash, he wasn't wearing his seat belt.

So I thank you for taking the time to listen to me. And please remember that red light cameras are not the problem, teaching the motorists to change their behavior behind the wheel is where we need to stop. If everyone stopped at the red lights, we wouldn't have to worry about what's going on with finding who's making money and what's going on. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Rachel. And I'd like to say thank you also for your work on car seat safety.

MS. LUGO:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I've certainly enjoyed doing the car seat safety with you, with my constituents.

MS. LUGO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So we have two presentations.

MR. NOLAN:

(Inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, shoot, I forget. Okay, I do apologize, we have no more cards. Is there anyone else who has not already spoken and would like to speak?

MR. RIVERA:

I submitted a card earlier to the gentleman in the front.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You did submit a card? I'm sorry. If you want to come forward, I'll double check. Go ahead. If you want to come forward, state your name.

MR. RIVERA:

Pardon me, I'm trying to find my statement. Good afternoon. My name is Dr. Carlos Rivera, I'm currently a resident of Brentwood, New York, and I thank you for the opportunity to address this esteemed panel.

I'm here to discuss the need for family law reform. I'm a pediatrician who was forced into retirement at the age of 49. Prior to the destruction of my career at the hand of Family Court, I used to lovingly serve thousands of children in the Patchogue-Medford area. As a result of gross miscarriage of justice, I was forced into retirement from my beloved art and profession. I am currently a radio show host and a lobbyist. Legal collusion, malicious prosecution, punitive rulings, misuse of Orders of Protection and non-persecuted incidents of perjury under oath are detrimental not only to the plaintiff or defendants, but is collateral damage which directly affects the taxpayers of this country -- excuse me, County.

In my case alone, my calculation estimates that as a result of my incarceration for my inability to pay \$15,000 per month in alimony and child support, nine employees were unemployed, their children were put on State insurance, my children were put on Public Assistance as well as State health insurance. I calculate that approximately \$160,000 was incurred upon the taxpayers as I served a six-month sentence in a maximum security facility as a result of this punitive judgment. Judges Barbara Lynaugh and Martha Luft awarded a judgment that increased a \$2,000 -- excuse me, \$250,000 arrears in child support at 9% interest by the end of my six-month incarceration. In order for CSE to collect 9%, or approximately \$25,000, it has cost the taxpayers over \$160,000 for this same time period. This is just one case of many.

My career was ended as a result of violation of my civil rights and wrongful incarceration by Judges Barbara Lynaugh and Martha Luft, both of whom ruled outside of their jurisdiction by incarcerating me for an unconstitutional contract without a proper court order. I continue to seek justice to no avail and the Family Court in Riverhead refuses to rule on my case and, in my opinion, has covered up this gross miscarriage of justice. This experience has awakened me to the business enterprise, the profits and the pain and destruction of families.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

The greater crime is the emotional and mental abuse that takes place as unscrupulous attorneys use children as pawns in the system. In my opinion, the courts currently turn a blind eye as custodial parents alienate children from loving target parents. This entity is known as parental alienation. This is a vicious form of child abuse that should be punishable -- should be a punishable offense. As a pediatrician, founder of March For Awareness, Board Member of Fathers and Families of New York and Member of Americans for Legal Reform and a radio show host for WLIR -- excuse me, LINY radio.com, I call out to you to draft and enact legislation to protect innocent children and truly act in a manner that is actually in the best interest of children. I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And if you can fill out a card and -- okay? Thank you. There's no one else in the room? Is there anyone else in the room -- you have not speaking yet?

MS. BERNHART:

I would like to speak, if I can.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You have not speaking yet? Spoken yet (*laughter*).

MS. BERNHARDT:

I have not spoken. Hi. My name is Mariel Bernhardt and I'm here, I'd like to finish Marie Tooker's speech.

Suffolk County officials and employees are part of a conspiracy to destroy our constitutional, God-given rights to people like me who expose their wrongdoings of corruption. This epidemic of criminal activity by people in power is long overdue for an investigative office policing the corruption that has ruined millions of families across America. Nepotism, cronyism and bullying by public officials is a systemic epidemic intertwined with private actors, has poisoned our government beyond another committee or a new office. The last thing the residents need is a new government office to watch their corrupt, good ole' boys club.

(*The following testimony was taken by Diana Flesher & Was transcribed by Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographers*)

MS. BERNHARDT: (Con't)

We the people need the fourth branch of government, which is our constitutional right. We are back to where we started when the Legislative body stripped the Fifth Amendment from the people to have a Grand Jury to go before without being tainted by a prosecutor or a Judge. We can clearly see now why our Forefathers put this in place. Look at the mess Suffolk County has done to the people, leaving the middle class with little means to thrive and the poor to become homeless and hungry. Drugs and alcohol are destroying our families and the political force is assisting it right here in Riverhead; except it's not Riverhead.

The investigation for the Suffolk crime family is simple; across the hall in the Records Room is all the evidence you need to prove corruption. Index and docket numbers is all you need to start finding the cases with the evidence to prove that our County is so corrupt that we need to clean house and start over. This needs to happen by everyday common people to establish a new common law Grand Jury so it is bomb-proof of the Suffolk crime family. Fraud upon the court is a systemic crisis in our justice system. We need another office run by the same local government; we need the fourth branch of government.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

John Scott Prudenti, Steve Bellone and many others need to do more than resign, they need to become whistle blowers to get time off their sentencing when they are convicted of one of the most horrific crimes, The Hobbs Act. Our justice system, both civil and criminal, are slowly killing people from trauma, PTSD and law abuse, that many are turning to drugs, alcohol and even suicide. To me, this is murder, a slow death or torture that is not visible to the eye. Anyone who is kidnapped and dragged into the arena of the justice court system can understand. With the grace of God, many people are going to come forth and tell their story of the corruption they experienced and soon we will have a serious abundance of proof of the wrongdoing by the powers to be in Suffolk County.

Now it is clear why Suffolk County is in debt. The people are paying for the corrupt, political players to have parties on yachts and in castles that celebrate pain and suffering of victims like me. These evil places hold poker games to see who they can steal from. They have an army and enough ammo and power to destroy lives, but they forgot about God, and God always wins and protects his people. Today is the first day that we can see some relief, and today we demand indictments, not resignations. We demand to give back our Constitution and restore justice with the fourth branch of government, the common law Grand Jury.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MS. BERNHARDT:

Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Now we will move with -- we do have two presenters. We have Lisa Rosenthal who wants to give us information on QR Care Card. And after that, we will have Optotraffic, so if anyone wants to know about Optotraffic, I would recommend they stay in the room.

Lisa, if you could come forward with the information. We are going past our time, well past our time, and we haven't even gone to the agenda yet. So, I apologize. If there's a possibility and we need to have you come back again another day, that would be fine, too.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Good afternoon, and thank you for having me. I'll keep my presentation brief. I'll start off by saying that I'm not here asking the County for money (*laughter*), I'm here asking all of you for your help and support to educate first responders and all of the different departments, and we can work collectively to help improve outcomes in an emergency situation for the public. So I have a two minute video which explains what it is we're doing, and then I have a few slides and I'll take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

*(*Video Presentation*)*

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Okay. So I've showed samples of what it is we do just in visuals; they're not actual cards, they're just a visual of what the card looks like. I do have a sample with me, if anyone would like to see it. And what it is, it's a wallet card, a magnet, a key tag and one decal for your car. And in that system, anywhere you need help, first responders or your caregivers will be able to instantly know what they need to know to share with 911 when they call.

Again, this is the visual of what it looks like. It's only created in the event somebody generates a profile; it's not a prepackaged product. And it's incumbent upon each consumer to update their information. We are independent of any third party; no hospital, no insurance company, no doctor's office. So each patient portal that you all have and all of us have in any of the systems we've been treated in are unique to that system. We steer clear of all of that. We are not aggregating medical records, and what we are doing is allowing the consumer to place critical information that can help them in their time of need.

This is what the app looks like. So the first -- the left, the first shot is what comes up when you open the app, and then the next two screens are what it looks like when your information is shown. So in the event that you have one emergency contact or several, if you've designated one or all, they all can be notified in the event that the code has been scanned. We also do something called a family circle that allows the family caregiver of, say, a senior in the home with multiple siblings, they're able to put a note into the system that sends it off to all the siblings as to what the update is for mom or dad or aunt or uncle, whoever they're caring for. But all of these fields that you see, they're all expandable, so if somebody has 30 different medications they take, the field will expand to accommodate that. It allows for an expansion to the extent that the consumer needs it. And our mission is really to improve outcomes for individuals in an emergency.

There's a lot of stats on chronic illness and the numbers of people that this is useful for, but the one stop that really blows me away is right on top, it's an estimate of 240 million calls are made to 911 in the U.S. every year; 70% of them are made from wireless devices. So having the information in a wireless way on your phone is really critical. A lot of times phones, the battery dies, there's a lot of reasons you may not be able to access the information that you store right on your phone, whether it's Android or Apple. But you can scan the tag with -- and always have it with you. So just a lot of different circumstances where it might be important to have your critical information with you and places that we don't normally carry it with us. The card and the key tag are both waterproof, so they can go along with us.

A lot of people have shared with me little slips of paper that they have written down information for loved ones that they care for. Sometimes the paper is frayed, sometimes it's smudged, sometimes the handwriting can't be read; this eliminates all of that barrier.

Also, one of the biggest issues is a language barrier; it eliminates the language barrier. So if you have people who aren't -- have senior parents who maybe their English isn't as good as theirs who had been raised and grown up here, it eliminates that person's need to communicate what medications they take, who their doctors are, what their medical condition may be. There are a lot of reasons and barriers to providing information, and a lot of times, even in a car accident, people are too nervous. They're a little bit in shock, they don't have a relative or a caregiver to go with them to the doctor to explain what's happening, stress or anxiety in an emergency situation, or if they're non-responsive. These are just some of the things that you're able to list. So emergency contacts, drugs, doctors, blood type, your preferred hospital, current medication, dosages, whether you're pregnant, if you have prosthetics, if you have an implanted device; all very important information.

Some of the benefits of the QR Care Card, and this is my Advisory Board. So we have a culmination of professionals from the health care industry, HR benefits, emergency services and finance who all have contributed to how and why this was thought through and what was put together.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I believe, Legislator Calarco, you have a question?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Just a real quick question, and you may have mentioned it at the beginning and I missed it. It sounds like a great idea in terms of being able to make sure people have their medical information available when they're in an emergency, especially if they're not able to communicate with the responders. My question is are you rolling this out to the EMS community and the providers and the hospitals in terms of them having an app that they use to access that QR code so that there's protection of an individual's privacy so it's not a situation where anybody who gets a hold of your QR Card can see what your medical information is?

MS. ROSENTHAL:

So the answer is yes; the app is free and it can be downloaded by anyone. The information that's provided through the QR code is no different than what you would write down on a piece of paper. There is no identifiable information; there's no Social Security Number, there's no home address, there's no telephone number other than for the emergency contact that you designate. So we are -- again, I'm going to just reiterate, we are not aggregating medical records. We are not providing a platform for people to provide all of their medical information, only what a first responder or a caregiver would need to know in an emergency.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Does anybody else have any questions? Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Hi. I'm not sure if you're aware, but I -- I don't know if you have someone here from the Sheriff's Department, but we have something similar like that in the County where they put the yellow decal.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

The Yellow Dot Program is actually a national program --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

-- that nationally they're trying to roll out for seniors, to tell seniors to place their medications and critical information in the glove box. So they're supposed to put a yellow dot on the car.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

So that's a national program. It's gotten a really hard start, so I don't know if the County's rolling it out or how they're rolling it out. And we are not looking to be an exclusive emergency tool. We're complimentary and we are -- it's a little bit different because it's a comprehensive system that allows notification instantly to family members, it has some other features to it. The Yellow Dot Program is great as just an awareness too, but it's limited in what it can provide. And again, handwriting and -- they have to be able to read it, it has to be -- and they have to be able to find it.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Then the other question also, let's say how have you -- and maybe I missed this as well, but how have you disseminated this to the PD?

So how do they know to look at the decal and say, *Oh, let me download this?* And is there enough time for them to even download the information at that time when it might be a critical situation?

MS. ROSENTHAL:

So no situation is -- no one tool is going to be a perfect tool for all situations. We did a lot of focus group work with different agencies and different first responders to get feedback to see what would be most appropriate. So right now the training revolves around having the first responder, whether it's fire or police who are on scene first, and it's usually one of those agencies before EMS gets there. And the goal is to have them take the keys from the ignition and hand them to the EMTs when they arrive, so the keys go in the ambulance with the patient. Because it's not always appropriate, there's not always enough time, it's not always the right circumstance.

But in answer to your question how am I rolling it out, we went live about six weeks ago. And our goal and my goal of being here in front of you today is to enlist all of you to help me with introductions and making sure that every agency on this Island is properly trained. It takes ten minutes. There's nothing for any agency to pay for, it's just an awareness, making people aware. So I ask all of you, you know, I'd love to meet with all of you and figure out how to do that collectively.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

Really very exciting, it's brilliant.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

And I think it's going to help a lot of people. It takes advantage of existing technology. I would like to work with you. I'm President of the Suffolk County Medical Society, and I would love to also introduce you to our group and maybe there's something we can do there also. But really, congratulations.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

And I think you're going to help a lot of people.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Any other questions? No? Okay. Well, thank you. I do apologize I had to leave.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

No, that's okay. Thank you all again for your time. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, I definitely think it's something that you should be reaching out to each Legislator. I know our Emergency Services I think would be interested in this, senior groups would definitely be interested.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

So our first adopters have been home care agencies and we're training thousands right now of home care staff that are in the home, from physical therapy to actual touch home care to companion care

services, as well as an insurance company right here on the Island who's adopted it as a compliance tool for patient care. So it's kind of chicken before the egg, which one comes first.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, right.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

But again, I thank you all for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tom, one last question.

LEG. CILMI:

Hi, Lisa. I'm not sure if there's anybody from FRES in the auditorium.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Not today.

LEG. CILMI:

Not today. Have you reached out to them, have they reached out to you?

MS. ROSENTHAL:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Haven't connected yet?

MS. ROSENTHAL:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. All right, we'll try and make that happen.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, we can help facilitate that.

MS. ROSENTHAL:

Great. Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you.

So, next we have Gotham Government Relations and representatives from Optotraffic to present the DragonCam. And it's a shame the room emptied out, because I know there was some misinformation that was being said with regards to who you are, what you're doing and what you do. So maybe you can dispel some of that misinformation also when you do your presentation. So we have -- Tom Bouchard. If you -- I guess you want to begin and you can introduce everyone.

MR. BOUCHARD:

Great. Thank you very much. I'm Tom Bouchard, the CEO of Optotraffic and we're here today to talk about a new technology called DragonCam. But first I'd like to have John and Howard introduce themselves who are from Suffolk County. So, go ahead, John.

MR. O'CONNOR:

How you doing? I'm John O'Connor, I'm the National Director for Public Safety Liaison Services with Optotraffic. And I grew up, actually, in Brentwood, my family still lives in Brentwood.

MR. LILLY:

Good afternoon. My name's Howard Lilly, I'm a Suffolk County representative. I live -- born and raised in Suffolk County, live in Stony Brook.

MR. BROUCHARD:

Okay, thank you. Just a quick overview, because I know we're running late. But Optotraffic is a Maryland-based company, and there's one thing that I would like to make very clear right up front, is our focus is photo-speed enforcement for school zones. We do not focus on red light *(laughter)*, which might be a good thing at this point. But we have a heritage in the aerospace engineering field. The founders of that company do things for NASA to measure large Earth structures with LIDAR, which is the technology we use to measure the speed, and along the way they created Optotraffic and we became a division. When our first customers -- I joined the company in 2011 and really built our business around photo enforcement in speed zones.

They key is that technology is always evolving, and certainly the concerns from the citizens that we heard this morning, we have heard throughout the life of Optotraffic for the last ten years. The technology that we have mostly deployed up to the last year or so has been the autonomous, portable systems that have the concerns about the right to face your accuser, big brother, that type of thing. But we have a new system which we think directly addresses, and based on all the feedback that we got from the folks we met with Suffolk County, really since the RFEI, which was almost two years ago, that we learn and we take that feedback and we say, okay, what can we develop with our partners to make sure that we address both the concerns the citizens have, as well as keeping children safe in school zones.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to John O'Connor who will introduce in more detail what DragonCam is and what it is not.

MR. O'CONNOR:

Thank you, Tom. Well, the DragonCam, by Dragonite Technologies, is actually a hand-held LIDAR unit. I'll put it here, if somebody wants to take it and pass it around and I can explain further as you're taking a closer look. It's actually a hand-held LIDAR unit with a camera installed on the side. So what it does is it takes traditional police technology and incorporates new technology, adding additional evidence to the violations that a law enforcement officer participates in the entire process of obtaining. That's the key with this unit. It is a traditional hand-held LIDAR unit that's currently in use for years in law enforcement. The only change is that there is a camera added to the side that adds the additional evidence of that violation, and the officer is a part of this entire process. So the officer would have to be LIDAR or laser trained and certified through the State. They have to be able to establish a tracking history, which means they have to pick out that particular vehicle, ensure that there's key indicators that they believe that it's actually violating the speed limit. They estimate the speed, then they use the device to confirm the speed that they actually estimated. The device would then take two photos of the vehicle and then it's stored, actually, on a computer that attaches to the unit. It's actually a smaller computer than what you're seeing up there, about roughly a little bit larger than like a Samsung Galaxy 7, maybe by a few inches. On the back-office end, Optotraffic would then process that violation through the civil process. It would have two

photos, a license plate and then it would, of course, be mailed out to the violator at that point.

Some of the key features about this that make it really good for enforcement is, one, it's not a system that you're going to put out where an officer is not there and it's static in place all the time. Officers can be strategically deployed by their command staff, varying precincts, wherever they need to go based on complaints from citizens. We have other jurisdictions throughout the United States that use this and what they do is they use it for constituent services at the same time. Some may have targeted complaints of actual speed enforcement violations and they send this unit out with an officer for about two hours, they use it and then they come back and they have the results.

I think some of the arguments that were made earlier, when you heard them and they addressed them, and I took a chance to write them down, I think one citizen said, *Putting law enforcement in the hands of our law enforcement, letting them do their job*. That's what this system actually does, it puts the officer back in the equation and it gives them another tool to be able to use it.

If the officers are out there based on the other programs that we work with, they're usually in a marked unit and they're standing by in uniform using this. So you have the visibility in the school zones as well, which acts as a natural speed deterrent.

Due process. With this, an officer would have to appear in court. So you don't have to worry about any of the arguments on the due process side because you're going to have a law environment officer that's appearing and testifying to the actual tracking history that went along with the violation that's issued.

So this device has been productive in Prince George's County in Maryland and various other jurisdictions in Ohio, and we do have a slide here from Youngstown, Ohio which shows the overall deployment of their system from the beginning. Now, this is a light touch. They actually go out only a few hours a day, maybe every other day for strategic enforcement. They had a stretch of highway that they were actually using it on in various school zones that they were seeing multiple fatalities in a year. Speeds were in excess of 20 to 25 miles per hour over the posted speed limit. The natural barriers that were set there for the highways were not able to be used because they were failing when people were in crashes leading to fatalities, or course, and further injury. After they started using this device, in conjunction with patrol as well, their total dropped by 35 to 40% of their actual speed. They have had zero fatalities on that stretch and their personal injury accidents have gone down. So through a strategic approach, using it as a tool with law enforcement, not just putting it out there as a regular automated system, you get to see results.

MR. BOUCHARD:

One point that John -- thanks, John. One point that John mentioned which came up quite a bit about the right to face your accuser, this -- we've redacted the personal information, but this is an actual copy of a citation that the City of Youngstown mails out with their civil violations using the DragonCam. And I want to draw your attention to the block on the bottom left where it's got the date and time of violation, posted speed, number, etcetera. Right below that block is a series of text that says, *"This violation was committed in the presence of Officer Patrolman M. Lee"*. That is the person who tracked and pulled the DragonCam trigger to generate the event and then who looked at it on the video and accepted it as a legitimate violation. So that person is the "accuser" in the world of the red light folks we're talking about, and on the right-hand side is the certificate saying who approved it. So there's actually two officers involved with one generating the citation in the first place, or capturing it, and the second being the person who looks at all the information as we present it back to the officer -- because, of course, you cannot mail anything without officer approval in any of these programs. And we highly recommend that the approver not be the acquirer, because that's kind of like the fox in the hen house. So we have two different people doing this and that's what we recommend to all of our jurisdictions. So this is something that can be done because this is

all done in software based on State or local requirements in terms of what the citation printing must say.

MR. O'CONNOR:

One of the other factors that goes into this device is officer discretion. So just because this has a camera on the side does not mean that that officer cannot use this to effect a traffic stop. So if they happen to be in a school zone and they want to effect a traffic stop with this vehicle, they can. So it's the type of enforcement and how the command staff and the officer use this device strategically during that time. So you're not losing the possibility of catching drugs, guns, the opiates, the heroin, anything else that may go along with it. This is a blended enforcement, basically bridging the gap of traditional enforcement and new enforcement to enhance basically overall enforcement for the law enforcement agency in itself.

MR. BOUCHARD:

This is the last slide. If a jurisdiction is interested, we typically go through a number of steps which takes many months. There's no rush to do this, we want to do it in the right way. We would be happy to give a test DragonCam out to the appropriate folks in the Suffolk County Police Department, and they have seen the device and they do appreciate the benefits that it brings. So we would do a no-cost test appointment for a month just to try it out. We certainly have draft ordinances and agreements and all those kind of things, and enabling legislation would have to be passed. But the key is -- and, you know, this didn't -- I don't think it happened particularly well in Nassau County, was making sure that the public knows what's coming, what is this device, a press event. We've done demonstrations with the DragonCam in jurisdictions with the reporters and with citizens, and it's actually quite powerful, because people get it. They're used to seeing a police officer with the hand-held LIDAR radar gun and they know what it is and, okay, here's a ticket and it's a moving violation with points; this is not like that, it's a civil citation, of course. But they understand the technology, so it's not the same thing as the autonomous, portable system with no right to face your accuser.

We would do a -- we would recommend a long warning period; 30, 60, 90 days, mail out hundreds, if not thousands of warnings to make sure people know, because you want them to slow down in the school zones, that it's a legitimate, credible program and that's what we recommend of all our clients, and it works, because you want these things to work for the long-term. Of course, public education, posting signs. And if it all works, perhaps going live at the beginning of school in September, that might make some sense. But certainly, whatever is the appropriate timeframe for rolling out this technology and the awareness and the warnings is key and making sure that people understand that it is not fishing with a net, it's fishing with a pole for the people who really are speeding in school zones. And as John said, they still have the option, they still have the discretion to go give them a real moving violation or pull them over for any other -- any other events that they may have committed.

So that's our presentation, and I guess we'll take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. And so it's very clear, our Police Department currently have the speed guns that they do currently use. This is just a newer technology, and it is something that a police officer has to have. It's not getting posted or placed somewhere, like a red light camera, it is something that a police officer will have in his hand, he is the one that's responsible for logging the information. If someone wants to go to court and challenge that ticket, the police officer is present. So with that, Legislator Cilmi I believe has a question. Somebody else?

(*The following testimony was taken & transcribed by
Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer*)

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you for your presentation. I always appreciate information here. I just wanted to make sure you were aware that a little more than a year ago, this Legislature passed, with a 16-0 vote, legislation IR 2167-2014. I'll read you the first RESOLVED clause. It says *"1st RESOLVED, that it is and shall be the public policy determination of this Legislature and the County of Suffolk that no school-zone camera program shall be implemented within the County of Suffolk."* That was signed into law by the County Executive some time in February of last year, and I just wanted to make sure you were aware of that. Because it seems to me that although the information, again, is appreciated, and it's always great to see, you know, companies that are successful, that this really wouldn't -- you wouldn't be able to do this here in Suffolk County, based on our current law, anyway.

MR. LILLY:

Yes, Councilman. The point and the reason we wanted to come here today was technology changes, and we know that what happened in Nassau with our competitor was not a proud moment for the industry and what happened there. But this wasn't available back in the Fall of 2014, this technology, the DragonCam, is brand new. So we've had several meetings with different people throughout Suffolk County, getting them to understand what it is and what it isn't, and this is a step in the process. We understand that if the Legislature does not want to change or write a new law specifically authorizing this type of technology and nothing else like it, perfectly okay. It was worth our time.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So you are familiar with that law that the County passed then.

MR. LILLY:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Could I -- Counsel's not here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sarah is right here.

LEG. CILMI:

Oh, Sarah's here. Can I just ask, through the Chair, Counsel; what would have to happen in order to implement something like this here in Suffolk County? Would we have to repeal or somehow amend this law? And would it be a Local Law, then, that we would have to -- that we would have to pass necessitating a public hearing, etcetera?

LEG. HAHN:

But this is different.

LEG. CILMI:

It's 2167 and it's establishing County policy against School Zone Camera Program, is the title of the law. So I guess it wasn't a Local Law when we passed it initially.

MS. SIMPSON:

Right. So we --

LEG. CILMI:

It was sponsored, by the way, by the Presiding Officer, DuWayne Gregory, Legislators Anker, Barraga, Browning, Krupski, Lindsay III and Spencer, and approved, again, 16-0.

MS. SIMPSON:

The Legislature always has the option to put in a new resolution repealing an old resolution, so that's one option for repealing the speed zone cameras for schools. I don't know exactly what would be required for implementing this specific program going forward, separate and apart from that. But you can always repeal a law that you -- that the Legislature has passed, obviously. We've taken action in the same nature. So if you're repealing a resolution you repeal the resolution; if you're repealing a Local Law, you'd repeal another Local Law.

LEG. CILMI:

So based on what you've heard presented today, would implementation of this device in Suffolk County require somehow an amendment to this law or repeal of this law?

MS. SIMPSON:

That's something I would like to actually look at on paper first because the presentation is not --

LEG. CILMI:

If you could review that and maybe, through the committee, just disseminate your opinion to the whole committee?

MS. SIMPSON:

I'm sure our office can do that.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And to add on to that, because the Police Department already uses speed cameras, this is what it is and it's being operated by a police officer. What I'd like to know is do we have to have State legislation to approve this? Because we already have police officers doing it.

MS. SIMPSON:

That's what I have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So I don't know if because this is a different technology, I don't know if you have an answer to that.

MR. LILLY:

We had some information, and I don't have the law in front of me exactly, but we heard that that was for fixed photo enforcement systems, like a -- which is not this, this is hand-held by the officers. So it's not clear if the law is broadly applied or is narrowly applied, I'm not sure, but it's something to take a look at.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, it does not -- it does not specify fixed systems in the law.

The other thing I'll just share with you as a concern, I've heard as recently as yesterday stories about folks who have come to our Traffic and Parking Violations Agency to dispute traffic violations. And the County will allow for multiple adjournments if a police officer is not available to come and testify, if someone wants to plead not guilty, but that the same latitude is not afforded to the accused. So that when the accused says, *Listen, I have -- you know, I'm out of town that day, you*

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

know, I can't get out of work that day, whatever, I'd like an adjournment, they're not permitted to have that adjournment.

I just heard this yesterday. So I don't know if that's the case or not, but I just wanted to make you aware that that's at least an allegation that's out there.

MR. LILLY:

Okay. You want to address that, John?

MR. O'CONNOR:

Is that in specific to the red light violations or traffic violations?

LEG. CILMI:

I heard the claim in general terms. It was not specific to red light violations.

MR. O'CONNOR:

I just want to make sure, because that sounds like something, at least from my dealings, being retired law enforcement. It's pretty much everywhere that you have to deal with that, but it sounds like it's more of a policy on dealing with the MVA versus the actual interaction with this program.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

MR. O'CONNOR:

So two separate cases. But I could see how maybe an influx of violations could put a burden on that, if that's where you're coming from with it.

LEG. CILMI:

I just think it's unfair. If somebody is accused of something and they want to come in and argue their point, to repeatedly ask them to take more time off of work, time and time again because a police officer didn't want to show up or couldn't show up or whatever the case may be I think is unfair to that person who is accused. Particularly when they're not afforded the same latitude.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tom.

LEG. CILMI:

I know this is not for you, really, and I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Margiotta is actually in the room, so that would be a question for him.

LEG. CILMI:

Yep, and for another time, I'm sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I appreciate it. Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you all.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you. Good afternoon. Tom answered one of my questions. There's obviously a lot of policy and a lot of laws that have to be looked into before we can even entertain something like this. My question is this is hand-held, correct, by the police officer?

MR. LILLY:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And what if he moves it a little while he's doing it; does that adjust the speed? Does that -- I mean, humans are fallible?

MR. LILLY:

John will answer.

MR. O'CONNOR:

Yes, Ma'am, humans are fallible. And that's actually called sweeping effect and it's one of the things that's covered in LIDAR training. The biggest thing when you teach LIDAR training to law enforcement is when in doubt, do not enforce; so if you're not sure about the speed, you don't enforce it. That's another reason that the officer actually is present to testify to those facts.

One of the unique things on this is that it has a target box, as technology advanced, and it also has a laser reticle, so you're actually pointing it at the location. If there is too much of a variance, these LIDAR units are sophisticated enough where they actually cancel it out if there's a huge variance and/or they detect a sweeping effect. So they actually are capable of seeing that sweeping effect if it's moving based on the timed distance. So basically the vehicle's approaching, you have one target point and then you sweep to the next target point, it actually picks that up and it will cancel it out. So it's actually built in. But it is the term sweeping effect.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR:

You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You mentioned that, you know, you get the right to address your accuser. Accuse who?

MR. RUTH JR:

(Applause).

LEG. TROTТА:

When you do the ticket and you do this, who are you going to accuse? Who are you accusing of speeding?

MR. LILLY:

The ticket is sent to the registered owner of the vehicle.

LEG. TROTТА:

Here we go again. Thank you.

MR. RUTH JR:

Exactly. That's theft.

MR. LILLY:

Well, there's all kinds of technologies you could use. But we do have, just for reference, and many of the jurisdictions -- actually, all of them in Maryland, there's a part of the citation on the back where you can -- if you weren't driving the vehicle, you can use an affidavit to transfer liability so the right person gets the ticket. So there's things that can be done. But that is the basic premise behind civil enforcement of speed violations.

LEG. TROTTA:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I didn't hear your question, but that's okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

I just asked if he --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. I didn't hear you because -- Tom, your question.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes, thank you. Over this way, guys. To me, this is just another piece of police equipment. I think you're in the wrong arena. I think you should be meeting with the Police Department --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

He did.

LEG. MURATORE:

-- and their purchasing department and the training in the Highway Patrol and sell your product to them. Because right now I'm sure we have well over a hundred hand-held radar units. So if we take your product and we buy your product, what do we do with the hundred that we have already? Because it seems -- this is just a step up from what we have now; it's giving us a photo. And if I'm correct, I mean, I was a police officer here in Suffolk County for a while, and the conviction rate on radar tickets is about 95%. You know, the equipment is calibrated, the officers are trained efficiently to operate the equipment. So when you go to court on a red light ticket, you're going to be convicted in most parts. There are sometimes that the hearing officer finds that, you know, there's not evidence, he's not accepting the radar, which is very rare.

So if we -- let's imagine we buy this equipment. Now, this is going to take a lot of manpower, a lot of manpower hours. We've got to train them in the use of the equipment. Now we use the equipment, people plead not guilty, cop has to go to court. So there's no change from what we already have other than being we get a picture. And if we have this equipment now in Suffolk County, if we have one or two of them, what's going to happen to the guys and girls that write the radar tickets with the equipment they have now? There's going to be a problem because the judge is going to say, *Suffolk County Police, you have the ability to get new technology. Why aren't you getting it?* So, you know, I don't know. And like I said, I think you're in the wrong arena. I don't think it's for us to decide if we should buy it or not.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tom?

LEG. MURATORE:

I think it's something that, you know, we should --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Actually, they have had meetings with the Police Department already.

LEG. MURATORE:

Good. So if, you know --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But I felt it was important for the Public Safety Committee to get the presentation so they could explain what they've presented to the Police Department so that we could see it. I think it's appropriate for them.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. But, you know, I'm sure they have a few dollars in their budget. It's well over 600 million, so they should be able to find a couple of dollars for some of your units, if they want them. But again, you know, the cops are going to have to appear. I don't see the change here. And you know what? Maybe -- you can do this in construction zones, right? You can go anywhere with this. It don't have to be limited to school zones, right?

MR. O'CONNOR:

You are correct. Right now school zones are one of the best places to do the enforcement, but if the Legislature decided that they wanted to enforce in construction zones or areas that had a large amount of fatalities such as the LIE, they could do that.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah. I mean, I see the summons you put up was written in a 50-mile an hour speed zone, so that wasn't a school zone.

MR. O'CONNOR:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

That was doing 65 in a 50, you know, so.

MR. O'CONNOR:

No, that was the one from Youngstown, Ohio, that I was -- in Ohio, they have blanket authority to enforce on any roadways that are within their jurisdiction. So they use it on the highway and on side streets and in school zones, so they have a vast authority to use the equipment out there.

But as far as the equipment, we don't sell the equipment. We provide it as a part of the service that goes with issuing the violations. The training is minimal for the officers because in order to use it, they're already LIDAR certified. It's part of a deployment schedule that goes out. So there's no overburden on the agency in itself.

The other portion about this is -- really key is officer safety. So if you talk about construction zones, you talk about the LIE, you talk about any roads that are hard to get out, this device will allow not only the officer to be productive, but it will also stop them from having to pull out at 85, 90 miles an hour on the LIE rushing into traffic. Also, it will help with the construction zones being able to enforce as well. So you have a different type of effect that makes the officer actually more productive in what they're doing and selective targeting. So not only is the officer safer, but when you have somebody pulling out at 90 miles an hour onto the LIE or trying to pull out and pull somebody over

in a school zone, you're going to have that issue as well.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, you know, I think you're marketing the product, you know, in a great way. You're talking about school zones, you're talking about officer safety and everybody, you know, falls to that and looks at it as being important. But it's equipment -- you know, it's giving us better quality equipment. I met with your people, it's a great piece of equipment. I think if the department has the money, they should give some serious thought about using it. But -- and I think, you know, the public will probably accept this a lot more than red light cameras because the officer is there operating it.

You know, most police officers are trained to be speed estimate experts; I know I did that. We can look at a moving vehicle and tell you within three to five miles an hour how fast it's going. So that's the first way, you know, the speeders are caught; when we see the car moving, we know how fast it's going. Now we implement your equipment or the equipment we have, most cops are hurt not pulling out, but when they pull the vehicle over, that's where cops are injured.

I know you have another product, too, about -- you know, you might want to talk to the department about that with officer safety when you pull the vehicle over, because that seems to be where a lot of our police are injured once the cars are pulled over. But again, like I say, you've got a great product, but I think you're in the wrong arena. I would definitely talk -- and you have, so good luck. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR:

Thank you, sir.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And we have Legislator Martinez, you have a question still?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Spencer, you're next. You had a question, right?

LEG. SPENCER:

I did. As far as your program is concerned, it sounds as if you would take a portion of the revenue that's generated when we use the product; is that correct?

MR. LILLY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Is there an upfront cost?

MR. LILLY:

No, there is not an upfront cost to the program, but we do get paid through the fee per paid citation, a percentage.

LEG. SPENCER:

Oh, okay. So would -- in the long run, I can see this as far as maybe the idea that an officer doesn't have to do a pursuit and a pull-over; that's really the difference in what you're offering. So we're enhancing the officer's safety is -- that's pretty much what it boils down to, the difference by having this?

MR. O'CONNOR:

That's one of the aspects of it as well. And if you're in any type of traffic situation, if there's anybody on the road, you're not causing that disturbance into the traffic flow where you might cause a traffic accident from the officer pulling out as well. So you have those aspects.

The other portion of this is the ability to send out a message to more drivers and change driver behavior through that message. So if an officer pulls one traffic stop, that's 15 minutes they're on that traffic stop. With this, let's say it's public service announcements, you're sending out a message to a wider group of people knowing that in any random school zone at any random point in time, that a law enforcement officer could be there enforcing this law, and you don't necessarily need to get pulled over to have that happen. So it's about changing driver behavior.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Rob, you have a question?

LEG. TROTТА:

No, I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No more questions? Okay. No one else? We're good to go? Wow, okay. Well, I appreciate you coming in because, you know, I know we did meet. And being married to a police officer, too, and knowing what it's like for them to pull people over, it is dangerous, especially our highway police officers. I know that right now we don't have the okay to do this. But again, we are looking at the safety issue also. We've had a lot of near misses on the LIE with police officers. I know we could follow-up later on another issue, because there's the law that requires you to move over to the next lane; I don't know if you want to expand a little bit on that. But too often, you know, especially on the LIE, it's hard, it's almost impossible. I've been stuck in that type of a situation, but when I see a police officer -- in fact, it happened on my way here. I was on the HOV lane, I have the Clean Pass sticker, but there was a vehicle that was pulled over and it was one person in the car and I saw the police officer, there's not a lot of room. So, you know, automatically, I know that the cars ahead of me, we all slowed down. There is no opportunity to move. But if you kind of want to explain a little bit about that.

MR. LILLY:

Yeah, just on the theme of we do innovate both software and hardware, and DragonCam's a good example, but we also have another one which we spoke with you about briefly the last time we were here which is our Slow Down/Move Over Enforcement System for officer safety. And actually, John is the inventor of it, so he'll talk about what that is and what we're doing with the State of Maryland right now with the MSP.

MR. O'CONNOR:

So I invented the system because I was actually struck on two traffic stops myself. I took a mirror to the back and that caused some severe injury, and another one I was hit and I was actually thrown over the hood of the vehicle that I was issuing a violation to. And then a good friend of mine

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

was on a traffic stop and somebody barrelled into him about 75 miles an hour, and to this day he's still recovering from that. So I try to figure out a way to enforce this law.

The Patrol Safe System actually works by using four video cameras and radar into an intelligent computer, that when the officer effects a traffic stop on the side of the road, it activates with the emergency equipment being turned on. It creates small clips of vehicles that fail to slow down below a reasonable and prudent speed and failed to move over. How it's done is the radar determines what lane that vehicle is actually in, as well as the video. It uses GPS technology to tell exactly where the patrol vehicle is at, what the speed limit is, gives the exact location. The computer then processes that image and then it would be sent back for a law enforcement officer to review, a former or retired law enforcement officer for all the elements of whether a slow down/move over infraction has occurred. It's then sent to the reviewing police agency for them to review it and say yes or no, it did not happen.

I ran a pilot program in Ohio over -- it was almost a year-long period where there was about 18,000 violations of the slow down/move over law. Not all egregious, it was just a pilot to collect data. However, during that time we did record a vehicle crash that the officer had to dive into the car, and we were able to provide that information, that tag to the Chief of Police and it turned out the driver was intoxicated; he could have moved over, but he was also intoxicated.

So the system does work. We presented to the Maryland State Police to do a pilot program with them. Things are moving forward. Basically, we're going to be mailing out public service announcements to everyone that fails to slow down and move over for egregious violations, collecting that data, showing that this equipment can save officer's lives by changing driver behavior. Because if the drivers don't know which emergency vehicle has this on it, they're more inclined to actually slow down and pay attention to the law, put the cell phones down, stop texting, stop doing everything else that they're doing in the vehicle when they see red and white, red and blue lights on the side of the road. This also can be applied for fire apparatus, EMS vehicles, construction vehicles; so there's a broad spectrum based on how the law is actually written that it can be put on. But that's what the system does overall.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And now, Tom, now you have another question, right?

LEG. MURATORE:

Another question, yes. So again, the summons is going to be written to the registered owner, correct?

MR. O'CONNOR:

Yes, it would have to be written to the registered owner of the vehicle.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. Because, I mean, you know, I don't think I have any problem with that because -- unless the car is stolen, most of us know who's operating our vehicles, whether it be the husband, the wife, the son, the daughter, the aunt, the uncle, the grandfather. So, you know, I don't know about that.

And what's happening with when you don't -- when you're not citing the operator, the fine is less, the insurance repercussions are less, and it could be an educational process. And that's the thing that needs to be done. I said this at another committee meeting, we need to change the way people drive; not only in Suffolk County, in the country. It's terrible the way people drive. I taught driving to police officers and I taught them to go a hundred miles an hour from point A to point B and not have accidents. You know, then I say again, we need to slow down. When you come into an intersection, the first thing you're supposed to do is you're supposed to reduce speed. I mean, it's

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

in the V&Ts, You can write a summons for failure to reduce speed to an intersection. So that's number one.

You know, as far as, you know, no person, no accused. You know who the vehicle is and you know who's operating the vehicle. So, I mean, I commend you on your product. I think that product should also be talked with the Police Department because I know -- and even the PBA, because I know the PBA's number one issue is officer safety, and that seems like a great product. That could -- that could really change driving. Because we have the signs up that say, you know, you've got to move over to the left when there's emergency vehicles, but a lot of people don't pay attention to it. And I think -- like the seatbelts, if we start educating people, particularly our young people, because you know now if you get in the car and you're a grandparent or a parent and you don't put your seat belt on and your three-year old is there, they say, *Put on your seat belt, Grandpa*, or *Daddy*, you know, *put your seat belt on*. So we need to do the same thing. And probably utilizing your product can probably be that little spark that starts the forest fire to get people to drive safely in Suffolk County.

Again, good luck. You know, talk to other departments. Have you spoken with East End departments? Have you talked to the Troopers? Have you talked to the Sheriffs.

MR. O'CONNOR:

We have been strategically meeting with the various different agencies and showing them the products. I know the Suffolk County Police Department has seen the Patrol Safe System installed on one of our Caprice Interceptors. So they did get a chance to see that and how the technology actually works.

LEG. MURATORE:

Oh, great. Great. Okay, well good luck again. Thank you.

MR. LILLY:

We met with the Commissioner the last time we were here, too, the Police Commissioner. So it was a great meeting, showed him the DragonCam, talked about Patrol Safe. So it's -- as you say, it's a very interesting technology that we think can keep officers safe.

LEG. MURATORE:

Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So Legislator Lindsay, you have a question?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes, I just have a quick question. Thank you for your presentation. My question would be would you be willing to do a pilot program, not issuing any violations, but just gathering data to show what could happen or what we are, what we all think is happening within our school zones now, but just to have statistical information to back it up.

MR. LILLY:

Yes (*laughter*).

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I believe that's a conversation you've had with the Police Department, to do a sample.

MR. BOUCHARD:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I think there's a couple of things. You know, while we've had the red light camera issue here, a police officer is present, a police officer has to go to court if, in fact, they are issued a ticket to their vehicle. I know that it can be done in two ways. One would be that the picture of the license plate is taken and the ticket is sent, and I think there's a lot of talk about the Xerox and, you know, where the tickets are going to and who's issuing them. If, in fact, you are -- you are to implement this program here in Suffolk County, where does the ticket go to? And if I wanted to call up about my ticket, who am I going to talk to?

MR. O'CONNOR:

If there's a program in Suffolk County, there would be Suffolk County residents in Suffolk County working at our facility in Suffolk County, so we would create jobs in Suffolk. All of the events that would be created by these units would be processed right here in Suffolk County with people that know the roadways. We would hire from locally, right here. The customer service representatives that would handle it would be people from Suffolk County. Every single portion of this, our supervisors, our managers, would be from Suffolk County, so we would create the jobs here. So if anybody here is picking up the phone and they want to say that, you know, *Hey, I was on Broadway at 2nd Avenue and heading up, you know, going towards East Middle School*, right?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I love it (*laughter*).

MR. O'CONNOR:

You like that? All right, good.

(*Laughter*)

Then people would know that. They would say, *Oh, yeah, I know exactly where you're talking about*. The same thing with the violations. They would be -- it's a local telephone number, so you're not calling Colorado, you're not calling California; it's a local telephone number with a local person. The same thing with where the violation would be paid, it would be local if the event ever came the point where you had that type of program.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And if someone -- I'm driving my car, you take a picture of my license plate but you don't pull me over. I know that there's two options that you can, you know, go ahead and register it where I'll get that ticket in the mail, or you can pull me over still with this product. But the difference is if you pull me over, right now if a police officer, you know, uses the camera, pulls me over, I'm going to get points on my license. But when you get the ticket in the mail and you were not pulled over, there is no points?

MR. O'CONNOR:

Currently, from the State level on the way down, without the Local Law, yes, there is no points and it does not go to the insurance company. It's the same perception as a parking violation issued to the vehicle, the owner of the vehicle. Yes on a traffic stop, of course you could have points assessed, and they also would be able to use the photographic evidence.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you. With that, I believe there are no more questions. We thank you for coming with the presentation. And again, I know that you've been -- you're working on the pilot with the Police

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

Department and we'll look forward to getting the end result. We'll probably have the Police Department come back with you to give us an update on how that program worked.

LEG. MURATORE:

If you could, could you let my office know when you're conducting this pilot program? Because sometimes communication falls down between the Police Commissioner's Office and the Legislators' offices. So if you can let us know that you are doing it and if anything's happening with it, please let us know. I'm sure my colleagues feel the same way. Okay? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes. And we have a Sergeant in the room, I believe he'll take that message back. Okay? Thank you.

MR. LILLY:

Thank you.

MR. BOUCHARD:

Thank you very much.

MR. O'CONNOR:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Now to the agenda. Okay, we have **Tabled Resolutions:**

Okay. **1042-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Charter Law to establish minimum qualifications and screening process for appointment of Police Commissioner (McCaffrey).** I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

1180-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to prohibit the sale of Kratom in Suffolk County (Stern). Is that closed?

MR. NOLAN:

It's closed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

He may want to table it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, he wants it tabled? Okay. So I'll make that motion to table. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

1370-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to further regulate synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic cocaine in Suffolk County (Spencer).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Did I hear Leslie? Sorry, Legislator Kennedy was the second on that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

LEG. CILMI:

Madam Clerk, please list me as a cosponsor. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, ***1395-16 - (Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law suspending the red light camera program (Trotta).*** I would like -- I don't think this one's going to just fly right through. DPW, our traffic engineers, Commissioner, you're here, I guess you might as well start heading up. And Mr. Margiotta, maybe you'd like to come up, and I guess Mr. Brown, whoever. I know that there are a number of you that are here to respond to questions and concerns about this bill. And throughout the meeting --

LEG. CILMI:

Madam Chair, I'll offer a motion to approve, please.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You made a motion to approve? Is there a second? No second?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But I want to make another motion; I want to discharge this without recommendation, this way everybody gets a chance to vote on it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we have a motion to approve. I need a second on the motion to approve.

LEG. CILMI:

Can we --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And then I have a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, what takes precedence?

MR. NOLAN:

The motion to discharge.

LEG. CILMI:

Takes precedence?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

All right, I'll second the motion to discharge then.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

So you're withdrawing your other motion?

LEG. CILMI:

I'll withdraw my motion to approve and support a motion to -- or second the motion to discharge.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Kara made a motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Did you make a motion to table?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was one motion to table; I guess I'll second it just to be seconded. Okay.

So I know, Commissioner -- oh, where'd he go? Okay, sorry. I know that you guys were sitting in the back of the room listening to a lot of questions about the red light cameras. I do think there are some legitimate concerns and complaints with regards to the red light cameras.

One of the first questions I have to say is the no-right-on-red. Having a CDL license and haven't driven a school bus, I know what stop means; stop means stop. Okay? You don't have to count to three seconds, which some people seem to think you have to, but in my training, the three-second rule does not exist, but there is such a thing as a complete stop. There was a question about the red light not having a camera, where there are traffic lights and a sign saying *No Right on Red*, there are no red light cameras. So maybe we can get a response on that; why are there no red light cameras at intersections where a sign is posted *No Right on Red*?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

There are.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, there are. I thought I heard somebody say there was not; I made a note. Okay, so that's misinformation, okay. No, there was someone that came and said that there are no cameras where there are signs.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Vanderbilt Motor Parkway, you've got a camera there.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes. We have to stop yelling from the audience, please.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. We're asking questions of our department. Also, the issue that was mentioned was the assumption that Xerox is monitoring the timing on the lights. This is a traffic -- so who monitors the timing on the lights; who makes that determination? Why do you make that determination on whether it's a two-second yellow, a three-second or a five-second? And then Mr. Margiotta, you can answer the questions as far as Xerox.

MR. HILLMAN:

Fifty-eight of the 100 intersections are at State, New York State DOT controlled intersections, so New York State DOT has the authority to set those timings, and they are the only agency that has the authority to set and/or modify those timings. Forty-two of the hundred are at Suffolk County intersections, and Suffolk County DPW is the only one who has the authority to set those timings and/or modify those timings.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Now, there's obviously conversation about that you've shortened the time on a light. Why would one light be maybe a two second yellow light and another light be a five-second light?

MR. HILLMAN:

There's an equation that is used to set the timings, the yellow and red clearance timings. And for a road that has a 30-mile an hour speed, it will be different than a road -- the length of time for the red and yellow clearances will be different at a road that has a 55-mile an hour speed. Additionally, other factors that go into that calculation are grade, width of intersection.

MR. RUTH JR:

Money.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Really? If you're going to yell out, you will be asked to leave. Thank you. If you want the answers to the questions instead of making up stuff, then listen. Go ahead, Bill.

MR. HILLMAN:

That's generally the difference. The geometric characteristics of different intersections, when you plug those geometric characteristics into the equation, you get different results. So you will have varying times depending on travel speed and geometrics at the intersections.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So in my district I have William Floyd Parkway, Montauk Highway, I talk about a very large intersection, a lot of traffic, the speed limit is 45, and then I have, you know, maybe further south of

that a smaller intersection. So the timing on both of those lights could be different?

MR. HILLMAN:

Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I don't want to hold up all the questions. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good afternoon, Gentleman. Thank you for coming. I just want to ask a question that was asked during the public portion. The State, on the State roads, obviously has an engineer that performs this calculation, so it has been evaluated by an engineer at the State level, and the same is true with the County; correct?

MR. HILLMAN:

I can only speak for the County and that is true for the County.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. HILLMAN:

I'm assuming that is true.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So then we do have an engineer that has signed off on the length of the yellow lights and the length of the red lights.

MR. HILLMAN:

That is correct.

MR. RUTH JR:

We have never seen an engineer still, anywhere.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. RUTH JR:

And we've gotten a Supreme Court order to see those signatures.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If you do not want to be quiet, you will be asked to leave.

MR. RUTH JR:

You guys never --

MR. NOLAN:

Sheriff, bring him out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sheriff, please remove the gentleman.

MR. RUTH JR:

You guys never ever gave us the signatures or stamps of licensed engineers, never once.

Applause

And We have a Supreme Court order.

(*Mr. Ruth Jr. Was escorted out of the auditorium by Deputy Sheriffs*)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I apologize, but there were a number of questions of people in the audience that came up and asked, I made note and I believe some of my colleagues made note of their questions, but they don't want to be respectful for you to give you an opportunity to answer those questions when that question comes around. I'm sorry, Leslie. If you'd like to repeat your question? Because now I don't know what you said *(laughter)*.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I got the answer for it already. I just wanted to clarify that an engineer did the formula, performed the formula on all the 42 Suffolk County intersections where there are red lights. And perhaps they don't have to stamp the bottom of it and that -- is that the reason why there's no signature on who performed the action?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah. I mean, we reviewed the timings. There's no -- yeah, there's no stamp. I don't know that we can produce a piece of paper that says this is signed off on by this particular person, I'd have to look into that. But I can guarantee you that we've -- I know that our traffic engineering division has looked at them and approved them.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Can you look into it so that we can calm one level here? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I guess the second part of the question was the impression that Xerox had something to do with that. So Paul, maybe you can respond?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yeah, Xerox has absolutely nothing to do with setting the times. They have nothing -- they can't touch any of the State timing systems or the County timing systems.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. I do have a few -- Legislator Fleming has a question.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just one question, I think for Mr. Hillman. When, if ever, have the clearings -- the timings or the clearings been altered or changed pursuant to the Red Light Camera Program?

MR. HILLMAN:

At the initial onset, when those locations, at least for the -- well, no, for all 50, all 100, that was part of the review process. So before a red light camera was installed, the red and yellow clearances were determined or calculated to see if they were adequate.

LEG. FLEMING:

And was that determination made pursuant to the formula?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

And was there any instance when the formula was altered or when an action was taken contradictory to the formula because of the red light program?

MR. HILLMAN:

No.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

LEG. CILMI:

Kate, I do have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Muratore?

LEG. MURATORE:

I think Legislator Fleming asked my question. But just for me, so none of the red light cameras were changed. The duration of yellow was changed after the red light -- after the camera was put on the light.

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, I can speak to the 42 Suffolk County intersections --

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- and that is absolutely 100% correct.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. So this allegation that, oh, we put up the red light camera and we changed the yellow sequence and that's why we're getting so many summonses. Good, that answers my question. Thank you, Mr. Hillman.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:

And I'm not sure if Legislator Muratore just asked the question, but so there were no -- were there any changes made at -- when you reviewed, prior to installing the red light cameras, there were no changes made to any of the durations or the clearances of the red or yellow lights at that time?

MR. HILLMAN:

We actually increased reds and yellows prior to installing.

LEG. CILMI:

You did.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Why?

MR. HILLMAN:

Because, again, red and yellow clearances have been around for 70 years --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- and the science behind it is continually updated. And we may have originally timed a signal 30 years ago, but as part of this program we wanted to make sure that the red and yellow clearances were up-to-date, and we did find some that were lower than what we would program today.

LEG. CILMI:

How many?

MR. PREGO

I don't have the number off the top of my head. We evaluated about 400 or so intersections as part of the site selection process, some percentage of those -- some percentage of those needed an increase based upon additional data obtained on the roadway.

LEG. CILMI:

Did any of them warrant a decrease?

MR. PREGO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Do you have records of how many were actually increased?

MR. PREGO:

I could try to dig that up. I'm not sure if I can pull that out of 400 intersections, I'd have to look at it a little closer.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, I'd be interested in seeing it. How many intersections do we control?

MR. HILLMAN:

You mean in the Red Light Camera Program or in --

LEG. CILMI:

No, in terms of intersections that we control the camera clearances. Not the camera -- the red light clearance.

MR. HILLMAN:

We have 650 plus traffic signals.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And you said that we evaluated 400 of them for the purpose of the red light camera?

MR. HILLMAN:

The 400 is inclusive of New York State intersections, so --

LEG. CILMI:

But we have in excess of 600 that we control?

MR. PREGO:

That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Do we, have we reviewed the timings of all of our intersections to ensure that the clearances equate to or comply with the formula that you used to calculate the others?

MR. HILLMAN:

That is a massive undertaking. But what I can say is that over the last decade, the majority of these intersections have been placed in our closed-loop system, and as part of that the intersections were retimed and clearances were recalculated at that time. So the majority -- some, I should say -- could be a decade old. We are initiating another phase of the closed-loop which will be to go back and start at the very beginning and start to retime our signals.

Retiming signals is something that never ends. It's something that you do on an ongoing basis. Traffic is always growing, and as your traffic demand changes, you need to go back and revisit your traffic signal timings. So it's an ongoing program, but with 650 plus, it's not something we can do every year at every intersection. It literally is decades worth of work.

LEG. CILMI:

When was the last time the formula was changed?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, we really can't get into the formula, meaning the changes up to -- the changes made to it; that's not something we're qualified to really speak to. There's a whole science behind that.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, but you said that from time to time they changed the formula. I'm just curious to know when the last time the formula was changed.

MR. HILLMAN:

Not sure.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. If you could --

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Nobody dies from a longer yellow light.

LEG. CILMI:

If you could get us that information, that would be interesting. I suppose it's the Federal Highway Administration that would change that formula, the formula that we use at least?

MR. HILLMAN:

We use the ITE, Institute of Transportation Engineers.

LEG. CILMI:

Which is a Federal -- is it a Federal agency? Is it some sort of a quasi-governmental agency? What is it exactly?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, quasi-governmental agency is a good term.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So Institute of Traffic Engineers?

MR. HILLMAN:

Transportation Engineers.

LEG. CILMI:

Transportation Engineers.

MR. HILLMAN:

And I believe the FHWA formula and the ITE formula are very similar, if not identical.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And so if you could provide me with details as to the FHWA formula, the ITE formula, and when -- you know, when the last changes to those formulas took place, that would be appreciated.

I don't know who handed this to me. Somebody handed to me a *Yellow Calculation Methodology*, it says, $Y = tp + \frac{[v]}{2a + 2Gg}$

Does that sound familiar?

MR. HILLMAN:

It sounds familiar, yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

So this is what you guys use to --

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, I'd have to double check it. I don't have the formula memorized or --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. ORTIZ:

I pulled that from presentation you guys gave.

LEG. CILMI:

I don't know who handed it to me, but I'm just curious to know if this is the formula.

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, I'd have to go back to the office and double check. I'm not prepared today to, you know, have a formula dropped in my lap --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- and confirm that this is the formula.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. I mean, I just assumed if you're using it to time all your lights -- and I recognize that, Bill, you're not doing this personally. But it sounds to me like this is like a well-known methodology. I'm curious to know if this, in fact, the formula.

MR. HILLMAN:

We can confirm that.

LEG. CILMI:

So I won't ask about the specifics of this formula because you don't know whether or not this is the one that's being used.

Okay, so you're going to get me the last time the formulas were changed, as well as the number of clearances that were changed as a result of review, a review that stemmed from the Red Light Camera Program being implemented. And for the moment, I think that's all the questions I have for you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Rob? No. I thought I had somebody else down.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I have question for them.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So I think you answered the one question, Bill, which was there has been no lights where we've decreased clearance times, the yellows or reds or anything along those lines that's been accused many times over; correct?

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Profit.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Do we have any knowledge -- because this is the other claim that's been made many times and is quite troubling to me -- of any accident occurring at these intersections that was a result of the red light camera that resulted in the death of an individual?

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't know how to answer that question. I'm not at every intersection, I don't view them, I don't see them. I mean, that's not a technical question that I can answer.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I mean, the accusation made is that these cameras are causing deaths; that's a pretty serious accusation to be made. So I'm asking, do you through any of the data that we've ever gotten, TPVA, does anybody have any way of correlating that information, that statement?

MR. HILLMAN:

What I can say, in my professional opinion, that is not accurate. And if you'd like, I can help parse the data. We have some talking points if you'd like. You know, we can -- the department is prepared to talk about the data that's in the report and help the Legislature try and understand that.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So the data that's in the report, I think there are some intersections where accidents have gone up, primarily rear-end accidents, and some intersections where we've seen accidents go down; correct?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And the decrease in accidents have been predominantly the T-bone type accident; correct?

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct. There's a 21% decrease in rear-end -- in right-angle accidents.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And the right-angle accidents are the ones that typically resolved in somebody being severely injured.

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

That was the intent of the program.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

The intent of the program was to correct driver behavior and have people -- less people running through red lights and stopping their vehicles.

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. When we talk about the tickets, and this is more of a question for Mr. Margiotta. I heard a lot of this about due process and the ability to confront your accuser and how do we know who's driving the vehicle. So I'm going to ask you about another part of your agency's responsibilities, parking tickets. How are your parking tickets constitutional? Because we don't know who parked that vehicle.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

The difference between a parking ticket and a red light citation is a parking ticket is in the criminal charge realm. You may actually be sentenced to 90 days in jail on a parking ticket.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Without even knowing that the owner of the vehicle actually parked the vehicle there?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

As far as citations go, the misunderstanding is they're not in the criminal realm, they're in the civil realm. It's a preponderance of the evidence, or clear and convincing evidence, the person can't be put in jail, there is no suspensions.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

But my point I'm getting at here is the citation, the red light citation is issued to the vehicle; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Because we don't know who's driving the vehicle, we don't have facial recognition, scanning into cars to find out who the person driving the car is. It's issued to the vehicle itself, to the tag.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Just like a parking ticket's issued to the vehicle's owner as well.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Exactly.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Just like if you were to blow through a toll booth or use an -- go through an EZ Pass lane without an EZ Pass, the State's going to issue a ticket to the vehicle owner; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So it's all the same methodology.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

But that's also why it's not a moving violation to the operator of the vehicle or the owner of the vehicle, because we can't issue a moving violation to somebody without knowing it was actually done. That's why if you run a red light and a police officer pulls you over, you get a moving violation.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And points.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Well, and points and everything else that comes along with a moving violation, but it's a moving violation, and that's the difference between the two programs; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Absolutely.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. So that's where that lies in the law. Now I've heard that it's unconstitutional, but this program is specifically authorized under the State of New York; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yes, and it's been challenged before the courts and upheld.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay, thank you. So if somebody feels that they were improperly issued a citation, they have the opportunity to go to court and make their case; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Absolutely.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And the accuser in that case is, I guess, the County of Suffolk; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

That's where it gets confusing for people. There's no accuser, it's a civil violation.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

So there's no -- the accuser only comes into play in a criminal way.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

But the prosecution is done by the State.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

By the County.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

By the County.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yes, sir.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And you sit before a Hearing Judge.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Absolutely.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And you have the opportunity to dispute the claim. I believe you have TVs in the courtroom so people can watch the video, and there are instances where judges have sided with the person who was issued the violation; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

All the time.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. So, I mean, you walk in there, obviously we expect that we are correct in issuing the citation, otherwise the citation wouldn't have been issued. So we would assume, or expect anyways, that the majority of the tickets would be upheld in court, but there are always times where we get it wrong, or at least the judge felt we got it wrong.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

More that the judge took outside factors into consideration and dismissed it in the interest of justice; the person was on their way to a hospital, they have proof that somebody died that day.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So they use their discretion as a judge.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

They do.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. That's a discretion that's offered to the judge only, not to the agency or Xerox or anybody else; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. I think that's all the questions I have for right now, but I may have more. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We've got a couple of more speakers, though; maybe by then you'll have another. I might have a couple, but I'll hold off until I let the others speak. Legislator Trotta has a question.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, just through the Chair. I have been looking at this in detail and I'm going to make a statement that I'm not a hundred percent sure is true because I think one camera might have been removed when there was a fatality. And I'm going to stress, I am not saying the cameras caused the fatality, because my whole premise is whether the camera is there or not, someone who's drunk or texting or something is going to go through it.

There were two fatalities at the 57 locations prior to the cameras being installed. In a 2013 report, which I have right here, there were six fatalities at the same intersections. One of those I believe was taken down, so the camera wasn't there, so it might be three -- so it might only be five, I'm not sure of that. So the reality -- and I want to stress, I'm going to stress this over and over again because this is my whole point here. I don't believe the cameras are causing deaths. If someone's going through a red light and they're texting or drunk or on heroin, they don't care if a camera is there. Okay? This is -- you know, 80% of accidents are caused by distracted drivers. Then you take in weather conditions, drugs, alcohol, so what we're talking about is reducing accidents to about the 1% that someone might do it. Now, in my Legislative District, I was saying it was over 100%, I was wrong. I have cameras, where the cameras were put up, 184% increase in accidents with injuries; it went from six to 19 at one intersection.

I am all for the cameras giving you a ticket if you run through that camera and it's a dangerous situation. But a guy pulling up to an intersection, looking to the left, no one's coming and just doesn't stop all the way is basically the equivalent of giving a ticket to someone who's doing 58 miles an hour on the Long Island Expressway. That's my concern.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Can I answer that?

LEG. TROTТА:

Sure.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And I think this is the issue that maybe people don't like to give credence to but, I mean, I've seen some of the videos that show this. So when you approach the intersection to make a right-hand turn and all you're doing is looking left to make sure nobody is coming and you think you can make the right-hand turn safely, you know who you're actually putting most at risk is a pedestrian or a bicyclist who's looking to cross the road because they have a red light to cross on and they are not seen, and they're the one that's actually going to get most hurt by that right-hand turn, because the person's going to run into him.

When they implemented the program, they showed how that's happened in other municipalities. That's why you're supposed to stop your vehicle, look both ways, make sure it's safe to proceed into the intersection and then proceed; not just approach, slow down, look to the left, make sure nobody is coming from the left and go. And 99% of the time, you know what? You'll probably make it through there being safe.

You know what? I get people all the time calling my office because people roll through stop signs. They don't come to a complete stop at the stop sign and 99% of the time when they roll through that stop sign, they're not going to hurt anybody. But it doesn't change the law that you're supposed to stop your vehicle, and it doesn't change the fact that when you do roll through it, there is going to be the chance you're going to hit somebody that you're just not paying attention well enough to see.

LEG. TROTТА:

You're taking for granted they didn't look to the right, maybe they looked to the right and to the left. You know, this program is clearly flawed. If we have a situation where accidents with injuries are increased 184%, there's a big problem. Another intersection, 122%. Clearly there is a problem. All I'm asking for is to suspend the program, look what's wrong with it, fix it, and if it's applicable and we can make it work where they're reduced at some locations, I'm all for that. But the reality is it's not working and people are mad. It's very expensive to live here on this Island and to sit here and to think this isn't a problem, it is a problem.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. But the suspension of the program does not come into effect until January of 2017; correct?

LEG. TROTТА:

Well, I would suggest that the cameras where anybody was hit, a substantial increase of more than 10%, those cameras should be shut down immediately because, quite honestly, I think there's some liability on the County.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So I think if you have some legitimate concerns about specific intersections, that's something that can be brought to DPW. And --

LEG. TROTТА:

I did that, I got no response. I am suggesting that we discharge this, let it go out, because this -- you know, I used to think the guy who would stand here and say people were dying because of this was crazy, but the more I look at it, it's very similar to the Burke thing. Everyone said, *Oh, nothing's going on, nothing's going on*, and all of a sudden it collapses. Now, who's to say this isn't happening?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Really? One's got nothing to do with the other.

LEG. TROTТА:

One has everything to do with the other. It's lack -- it's good people sitting here and doing nothing, that's exactly what happens.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And there's people here who are doing something about everything. And I'm sorry that you feel that way; however, I don't know how we survived without you.

LEG. TROTТА:

I would ask that it be put out, discharged without recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Kara, did you have a question?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

He's looking out for our safety.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So a bunch of the questions that I had, I was taking notes, you know, during the speakers and from previous. We had asked about the retiming of the intersections and the thought of shortening, that didn't happen; we asked about the unconstitutionality, that was explained to us; it was asked about none of the cameras signed off by engineers, that was addressed; it was asked about the deaths being caused by the cameras, that was addressed.

I was concerned, I was concerned, someone spoke and said that there was a lien -- I think her name was Tara -- a lien placed on a house for a red light camera ticket. Is that -- do we really do that?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

It's not a lien on a house. If you don't pay your fine and you ignore your tickets, some people have ignored thousands of dollars in tickets, it becomes a judgement. When you go to sell your house, they will make you pay any outstanding judgments to a credit card or to anyone else. So it's only if you try to sell your house while you have a judgment filed against you that you'd have to pay it.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

In other words, the answer is yes.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Why can't we see the footage?

LEG. HAHN:

And the judgment is because someone has refused to pay.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. And then I do have one more.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If you cannot be quiet in the audience -- a question is being asked, the answer is being given; if you're talking, you're not hearing the answer or the question.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

It's the wrong question and answer.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You can choose to leave if you want to continue to interrupt. Kara, go ahead.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You can choose to listen to us.

LEG. HAHN:

So -- and maybe this is directed at Bill. Because I wasn't -- I was at the Legislature when we originally passed the red light camera approval, but I was not a Legislator; I worked for the late Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay. And we expected there would be an increase in the rear-end crashes. It was not -- you know, many things we deal with here are not black and white. There are choices that have to be made.

The policy decision was do you institute an enforcement mechanism that will decrease the right-angle crashes which cause the more serious injury and death with a chance of and the expectation that there will be some uptick in rear-end crashes? However, the report did talk about a small number of intersections where there appeared to be a very large number of rear-end crashes, that could be for a host of reasons. It could be close to a school where many of the kids are texting and driving, it could be a parking lot that had -- you know, there could be a host of reasons. However, my question just is having received that report or producing that report where there were statistics like that, where real serious outliers -- not just an uptick in rear-ends, but a serious increase -- has there been an analysis, a traffic analysis, a study of those very small number of intersections with a very high increase? Has there been, you know, a rethinking or have you looked through every police report to try to determine what's going on at those intersections?

MR. HILLMAN:

That analysis is ongoing right now.

LEG. HAHN:

So you're looking at it. I mean, the report did just come out like a month or so ago; correct?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So we're reviewing those intersections, trying to figure out exactly what's going on, and there could be a possibility of removing the cameras if necessary.

MR. HILLMAN:

The 42 intersections that are under County control, we're reviewing those. We're in discussions with State DOT for the 52 that they control. They have jurisdiction over the roadway. They'll parse through the information in the report and make any recommendations, or actually take any action that they deem necessary. We're doing the same thing on our roadways.

LEG. HAHN:

So, you know, we're clearly concerned about those. I would ask -- and I know that the Commissioner is in the room. You know, certainly the intersections where there's been that high uptick, I think, you know, all due haste is needed in reviewing what's going on so that we have a real answer. And I have no doubt that there's a possibility of other things that could be happening and could be part of the cause of this. As we had a speaker here earlier say, there are all kinds of -- there's a huge increase in accidents just in general because of distracted driving. People are texting and driving, people are checking Facebook and driving, people are using their cell phones, holding it up to their head and driving, and this is happening more and more and red light cameras are not going stop that.

What red light cameras were designed to do was the folks who are choosing to put their foot on the gas when the light turns yellow, they will rethink that and they will actually stop at a red light, and that will save lives when people know that there could be consequences for running a red light. And that probably already has because we've had a significant decrease in T-bone crashes which are the more serious, life-threatening types of crashes, and that's the purpose of the program.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Are you done?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So Legislator Spencer, you have a question? Oops, sorry.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you. I understand just practically what you're trying to do and manage the program, and I have listened to the concerns over the last two years from a lot of people who were coming in, everything from the contract to the lights to the safety to the right-on-reds, and it's hard for me to discount the public outcry that's there. And I guess I'm hearing the word review, but with any program -- I mean, you know, there's a lot of smoke here, and for me to say that there's no issue here, there's nothing going on here and to just vote against any sort of change, I don't think that that's reasonable also.

Applause

So I guess my question is -- I hear that it's under review, but can you just tell me as far as some of the concerns, the contract, the yellow timing, the review of tickets, is there any overall review that's going on internally that will allow us to make this program better?

MR. HILLMAN:

We are reviewing -- the department's reviewing -- well, I should say the department's responsibility is to review the data and make recommendations to TPVA. As far as the management of the program and improving the program, I think that falls to TPVA. We're prepared to talk about our preliminary investigation into the accident data; I don't know if that's where you were heading with this. But with regard to overall improvements to the program, I would defer to the Commissioner.

LEG. SPENCER:

That would be great. I mean, I don't want you to defend the program, I'd like us to kind of sit down and say, all right, with anything that we do. There can be some things that are just unintended consequences that aren't working out. I mean, there are real people that are talking about situations where there have been deaths and accidents. And maybe we can say that there's misinformation or certain things are wrong, but when I look at everything in total, there's something going on. And I just want to make sure that I'm doing my job to -- my oversight job, my job as a representative of the people to at least make sure that I have looked at this with a very detailed eye and that there is some plan that, at least from your perspective, that when you're hearing all of these stories, that maybe not one story or you could discount or defend, but when you look at everything in total and you look at that there are people that are young and are old that are various -- you know, it's not just one area. It's people coming in from all over and they've been coming in consistently and they've been taking time out of work. And so I guess that's my question; has that prompted you, Paul, to say, *Hey, guys. What's going on here? Is this program the best it can be? Are there issues? Do we need to look at where these lights are placed? Are there signs of warning people? Are these yellows appropriate?* So I'm curious to hear from you, Paul, just from you in your roll as Commissioner.

Applause

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Legislator, I'm continually looking at traffic safety and safety in Suffolk County. I won't give you my personal opinion, I'll give you some of the numbers that I have, that I have looked into. I don't know that they are dispositive or they explain the issue, but I want to give them to you.

Six out of ten people who get a citation from a red light camera only get one ever in six years; eight out of ten, two in the six years of the program; two out of ten are outlying and they get more than two. In 2014 to 2015, there were 34 plus thousand less citations issued. But the real statistics for me that keep me up at night and make me worry about traffic safety are these, and I don't have an answer for why, I don't have an answer. Between 2012 and 2014, Suffolk County saw an increase of 34,000 licensed drivers. We went up 34,000 people on our roads. When prior to 2012, the average, though it went up and down every year, was trending down. So I do not know what happened in 2013 and '14, I've been given suggestion, but we went up 34,000 new licensed drivers on our roads. So that's a major increase and that's going to be a safety issue for me and worrying about how many people are on the road.

We also lead the State in registered vehicles. So we have the highest number of drivers, licensed drivers in the State of New York. We have the highest amount of registered vehicles in the State of New York.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

Those are the facts that I have. Also, the distracted driving, the citations -- the tickets issued for texting and driving and cell phone has gone up more than double since 2011, I believe. There's a large amount of people getting tickets for distracted driving which tends to cause rear-end accidents; however, that would be everywhere.

I did look into one intersection that had a major increase in accidents, this is Indian Head Road and Harned Road on Jericho Turnpike. In 2013, one of the three corners was an empty shopping center; in 2015, there is a major service station on the corner. Could that have had an impact? I can't answer that. I'm looking at what's in front of me and I'm just telling you that traffic safety is an issue everywhere and we should take it very serious.

LEG. SPENCER:

One thing that I can see -- you know, and I realize as far as you got the engineering, you got the program, you got the lights. But one thing that is under your control is how these cases, when there's video evidence and someone reviews them, that understanding the concern that's out there, have you tweaked your -- I guess, your discretion a bit? Where you see these cases over and over again where someone is at a right-on-red and they come to a microsecond stop. Have you done anything where you've said, you know what? There's -- where maybe in the past, to the letter of the law you would have said, *That's a ticket*. Have you looked at it and said, *You know what? This person is an 80-year old person* or something. You know, you have a little bit of discretion, or people are saying that the camera is judge, jury and executioner, that there is someone reviewing those? Have you put a review policy in place where maybe two people could look at these videos and there has to be agreement between the two that a ticket should go out? I mean, there are some practical administrative things that I think that you can do as a Commissioner that would help also the public outcry with this program. And if you haven't, I strongly ask that you would consider it. If you can maybe give, whether it's ties or whether it's a perception issue or where it's really close, that if there was an officer on the scene that you could exercise discretion. Have we done anything like that or is that something you can consider?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I'm not sure I have that discretion. The judges make the call whether or not they went through or not. I would think I'd need to be given the authority to do that by this body. So I take the position that I play no part in determining whether the person went through the red light or didn't. All I do is I log the citation; if the person requests a hearing, I assign them a date for a hearing; I make sure there's a judge there to hear the case and the judge makes the decision. If this body gave me more discretion and set a policy or asked me to create one, I certainly would.

LEG. SPENCER:

I don't know what the answers are, but I do feel strongly that we have to do something. I don't want to just do something to do something, but I do believe that this is -- this isn't something that is just a few people that want to break the law and that they have to toughen up. I mean, there's something that's concerning here.

My last question, because -- and I have a lot more, but I'm going to be -- this is -- I want to be considerate. As far as -- and this may go to Bill. You know, I heard something you said, that it's decades worth of work as far as the timing and each intersection and the calculations. But, I mean, I know with even my watch, we're talking about something that are set to tenths of a second. And these lights are out there 24/7, there's electronics that's clicking, there's wind, there's rain, they're getting banged around, there's temperature variations. Has there been any studies or any information as far as looking at the actual electronics that are involved and timing that yellow to making sure -- I mean, even if there's some drift there as far as extreme conditions as far a relay. I'm not sure if we're talking about a circuit or a relay firing. That could lead to some discrepancies and time. If it can happen with my stop watch, if it can happen with my i-Phone or my computer.

Do we have anything that is -- so if we're not maybe getting to a light and recalculating and looking, is there any quality control as far as the technology and the lights and the timing, or is it possible that there could be some drift on the timing?

MR. HILLMAN:

Excellent question. The technology from decades ago did have those problems. The technology used today is what we call hardened for outdoor use and we do not have those issues. And again, in our Closed-Loop Traffic Signal Program, we've replaced almost every controller to have this new technology, and every red light camera location does have that new technology. So there's no chance of drift or -- in addition, we have communications to a desktop back in our office with the traffic signals; so if there was an electrical problem say, we would be aware of that. Again, we have -- well, the towns have maintenance contractors go out and take care of those things, so I can assure you that the equipment is not the problem.

LEG. SPENCER:

Well, I know it's a very difficult job, but I would encourage us to get together and to really try to put this program under a microscope and looking at everything from start to finish. And there's a lot of frustrated, angry, concerned people that are suffering loss. And even if we turn away this bill, we have to do something. So thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. We have quite a few more questions yet to go. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Just quickly. I know from time to time we move cameras around. Have we ever -- do we do an analysis of, you know, pre-camera accidents, post-camera or with camera accidents, and then after we remove the camera accidents, violations, whatever; any sort of metrics that measure those conditions?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, that's what the report is; it's pre-accident summaries and then post -- or during accident summaries.

LEG. CILMI:

Camera; pre-camera --

MR. HILLMAN:

Pre-camera and during camera.

LEG. CILMI:

-- and during camera. And what about after?

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't believe we've done an after. Alex, are you aware?

MR. PREGO:

I know there's a table in the report, it's called *decommissioned cameras* at the end of the report, the ones that were relocated as well. Right now our focus is examining the ones that currently have red light cameras.

LEG. CILMI:

Have we ever moved a camera from intersection A and then put a camera back at intersection A?

MR. PREGO:

No, we have not.

LEG. CILMI:

So we have no way of knowing whether or not the change in driving behavior at that particular intersection -- if there was, in fact, a change in driving behavior -- was sustained after the removal of a camera.

MR. HILLMAN:

No. However, again, as traffic engineers, we rely on three years of data. We've had a six-year program, so I'm not sure that we would actually have three years of data after moving a camera. We base our decisions on three years of data. And I would like to point out that the report, the 42 intersections, the data is only 18 months at most. Most of them are just over a year's worth of data in the present report.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Okay, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I know, Paul, you're probably sitting there, I appreciate you're here today. I know you had a surgical procedure done, so I'm sure you're possibly not feeling too comfortable, but I appreciate that you did come today. Legislator Trotta, you have a question?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yeah, a question. I mean, I'm looking at this again, the 2013 report, and in the 2013 report there's accident severity and there's a section for fatalities. And when I read the pre-construction, there were two and I read post-construction, there were six; so that's a 200% increase in fatalities at those locations. My first question is why didn't you do anything and advise us of this, one; and two is how come you took it out of the 2014 report?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Is that to me?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Nelson & Pope prepares the report that have to do with accidents and the statistics that you read, we prepare the rest of the report. So you had asked me that just the other day and I didn't even know that they didn't put it in '14, so I have asked for that data to be given to me and I will give it to you as soon as I get it. But the data I did have, I'm not sure why, is not the same as yours. I had accidents in 2011 as two, 2012 as one, 2013 as zero. I don't know what numbers they're giving me or --

LEG. TROTTA:

I have the report from you, from 2013, and there's six people were killed at camera locations.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Was it one accident?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Which camera?

LEG. TROTTA:

I can give you the locations, if you want to know. I'm reading your report.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

They're accidents, more than one person could be --

LEG. TROTTA:

Fatal. Well, there's five ones and one two, or four ones and one two.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

And they're not cumulative?

LEG. TROTTA:

No, they're different locations, I'm assuming --

MR. MARGIOTTA:

No, they may be cumulative from 2010?

LEG. TROTTA:

No, I'm reading just one year after the cameras were put up, this is after the cameras were put up. My question --

MR. MARGIOTTA:

2011.

LEG. TROTTA:

No, 2013; here's the report.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Okay, they went up in '10.

LEG. TROTTA:

Excuse me?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

The cameras went up in '10, in '13 they added.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes, this is 54 cameras, and at 54 cameras there were six people killed. The pre-report there was only two people killed.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

We added 50 more cameras -- I mean 50 more intersections in '13.

LEG. TROTTA:

This is the intersections; the same intersections that were pre and post, these were the additional ones. This is your report.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I'm confused, I'm not trying to argue with you. In 2013, I believe it is, we added 50 additional intersections. So we went from having 50 in '10, '11 and '12 --

LEG. TROTТА:

This is the pre and post for those intersections.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Okay, so one intersection went up; is that what it is?

LEG. TROTТА:

Well, the --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can I ask a question? So you're saying that those accidents were caused by cameras.

LEG. TROTТА:

I am not saying that at all. But my whole point of this whole thing is that this Red Light Camera Program is only addressing a very small portion. The guy who's drunk, the guy who's texting --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, but --

LEG. TROTТА:

-- the distracted driving. So what we're trying to do is instill on our citizens this huge burden to try to control accidents of a very small nature. It's not about safety, it's about revenue.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Previously you mentioned --

Applause

Previously you mentioned accidents at intersections and the reasons why; sometimes it's drunk driving, drugs, texting. So we don't know why those accidents were occurred.

LEG. TROTТА:

But I can tell you --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, let me finish. So what you're trying -- what I'm hearing from you is that post these cameras, that now -- in 2013, people were killed where there's red light cameras.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes, but that's not the issue.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But you're giving the impression that it's because of the cameras.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not -- I can't be more -- more open. I'm not saying they caused --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But it could have happened without a camera.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Let him speak.

LEG. TROTTA:

Of course they could have happened without a camera.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So it could --

LEG. TROTTA:

Having been a cop for 25 years, I've gone to these locations and I've seen a guy drunk, I've seen a guy on heroin, I see a guy texting. Whether there's a camera there or not doesn't make a difference, that person's going to make that mistake. So what would --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If there was no camera, the accident might have -- the fatality could have happened.

LEG. TROTTA:

Of course, exactly.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I just wanted to clarify that.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's why this is a flawed program; the one that prioritizes revenue over safety, a program that utilizes little or no discretion and it's unfair to the public.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But what's that got to do with a camera?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

An increase is an increase.

LEG. TROTTA:

It's all you're doing is putting a tax on the citizens of this County that they can't burden, under the disguise of safety, and that's the reality of it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I'm trying to get you to clarify the number --

Applause

Okay, you're saying that people were killed at certain intersections and you're trying to -- and it looks like you're correlating the accidents and those fatalities to red light cameras.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

It's a possibility.

LEG. TROTTA:

No, I'm not saying that at all. I couldn't be more -- I'm not saying that at all. I'm saying those people -- like when someone says, *Oh, the right-angle cameras were reduced by 21.6%*; do you know what that accounts for? Thirty-eight accidents, 38. My daughter was stopping at a yellow light and got rear-ended, and guess what, there was no red light camera there. So I could take that -- and I'm sure that happened more than 38 times in this County where someone slammed on their brakes or made a decision thinking there was a camera and it caused an accident. To say that it actually reduced it by 2% is a lie, absolutely not true, because other people got in accidents

because they thought cameras were there. And we could all sit here and stick our heads in the sand; it's about revenue and it's wrong what we're doing to our taxpayers.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That's a different issue. That's a different issue. Okay, so we're making very clear, the red light cameras did not cause those fatalities. Okay.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Oh, for God's sake, All Mighty.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Let's see the footage.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You have another question?

LEG. TROTTA:

I just would like this discharged and let everyone see where every Legislator stands next Wednesday, that's all I ask.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We have three more speakers, three more questions. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, my first one, I guess, is to Bill. You spoke about the Harned Road and Jericho Turnpike intersection; I had requested field reports for all of the accidents in 2014. Nine weeks ago yesterday I got some of the information I requested, so I can't make a decision there. You are correct, there was a gas station put in, but there are additional issues with that intersection. So once I get full information, I'll be able to make an intelligent decision on whether it's red light camera related or something else. But at this point in time, I haven't been given the tools, and it's not your department.

I just wanted to get to two other things that were brought up, and this is for Paul. One of the ladies got up and spoke about funeral procession and I've been through this before, she said the lights are not detectable on the camera. I know for a fact they are detectable; is that correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I'm sorry, could you just repeat that?

LEG. KENNEDY:

During a funeral procession, when you have your emergency flashers on, they were detectable to me when I observed it on the camera, so is that true that flashes are observable on the camera and all the individual has to do is present it and point it out?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I would think most of the time they are; sometimes they're not, but most of the time they are. However, it's not dispositive if they went through the red light. Nothing would stop oncoming traffic. So unless it's in extremely close proximity to the hearse and it happens simultaneously with the camera -- with the light turning red, we don't take it into consideration. If that is the case, then they absolutely do take it into consideration. If they see a hearse, the light is just changing, the person's flashers are on, they send in a letter. However, there are times where the red light may be

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

a red light for four or five seconds and a car will go through that red light, almost cause an accident and have their flashers on; they ran the red light.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. My second question is for the woman who stood up and said -- because her son was involved in a four-car accident at an intersection, and because no citation was issued to any of them, they couldn't get a copy of the film. So my question with that is if you have, say, a four-way intersection and there is a major accident there, the cameras are going off all over the place; correct?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

If somebody went through a red light.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, yeah, if somebody goes through a red light, they're going off all over the place.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What does the system do at that point; does the system -- why did no one get a citation?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

If someone went through a red light and it wasn't -- maybe someone going through a yellow and the other person jumping the light without a camera, or someone going through a red light that didn't have a camera which would not create footage. It's only if you go through -- we call them approaches, so you may have a four approach intersection, only one of them may be covered by red lights. So if someone went through the other -- one of the other three approaches to the red light, there would be no footage. There may be footage, but a citation may not be issued because the law states if a police officer issued one, then you can't issue two. So that would be the only two reasons I could think of. But if I'm subpoenaed, you know, if an attorney sends me even a letter, basically, I give them whatever footage we have.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You do.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Oh, absolutely.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

That was me with the three cars.

LEG. KENNEDY:

May I ask the woman who spoke, Kate, to explain?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I think -- I believe she's your constituent, right; no?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I don't even know.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think that's a conversation that could be had with her and under traffic court.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

Tom Cilmi is my Legislator.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's a personal issue and I think that's something that can be handled with her.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

It involves me, let me clarify what happened. That accident, we asked for footage.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We can talk to you afterwards, because the public session is over.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

No, everybody should know.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, we could all talk afterwards.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

The insurance companies asked for it and it was not provided.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We're already now into the next committee.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

You're not listening!

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Excuse me, ma'am. Your issue is important and it needs to be addressed. We are willing to work with you to have that addressed.

I am not -- I will find your card.

LEG. CILMI:

Madam Chair, if I may? Sarah, just call my office and we'll work on that together.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, good.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think that's the more appropriate way to handle it.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

And if it requires you to come back to a meeting to have a larger discussion, we'll do that.

MS. FOGELSTROM:

It would be appropriate to let people know what's going on.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Leslie, do you have more questions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, I'm finished.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. We have a couple of more questions yet to go. Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

It's more of a statement than a question, just a quick follow-up; it's a follow-up to Legislator Kennedy's question. Paul, if there's no violation issued, is there any video that's recorded that's preserved?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

It would be destroyed in 30 days.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

If there was a violation issued.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

If there was no violation. There are, actually, hundreds of --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I was going to say, because the cameras are running, right, but that's a severe amount of data to store over a very long period of time. So it's a 30-day cycle and after 30-days the data is destroyed?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

If no citation is issued.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Unless there was a reason to preserve it.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. In regards to all the violations and all the data related to those violations, Xerox is responsible for storing all that information?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Have we ever requested of them to make that data available to us in a computable format, you know, like a spreadsheet type of format?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Like an Excel?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yeah.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I believe they have the Excel, but they send it to us as a PDF.
I could just request that they send me a copy.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I would request that you do that, and I'll get to where I'm getting on this. So I would agree with Doc Spencer, with Legislator Spencer, that the program certainly appears to have some issues where we should be taking a look at it. It sounds like Public Works is certainly looking at some of those intersections to see if there are particulars with those intersections that are causing an uptick in the rear-end accidents. But one of the things that I met with the individual from AAA recently and he testified on the record last meeting, was that when he looked at the report and he divided out the 50 intersections that were existing for the past three years versus the newer intersections, the 50 intersections previously were performing very well and were actually doing exactly what they were supposed to be doing and that was effective, and it was because the way the report was developed lumping all of the intersections together, it created an appearance that it wasn't effective in the same manner, whereas the intersections with only one year were still going through the so-called growth period of the learning curve, so to speak.

So they would like to be able to get some of this data. And as you may know, I'm the Vice-Chair of our Open Data Committee. I authored the Open Data Policy for Suffolk County. I think that the public has every right to see the information and data that's there, including the data on how long the yellow lights are at the particular intersections; if we have that, we should be able to make that available. The violations that have occurred and being able to correlate it against the accidents that have occurred at locations and allow either us or anybody in the public including AAA, if they want to be able to, you know, try to work through that data and find -- make their own correlations, then so be it. I'm always open to hearing -- you know, having people look at the actual information that's there instead of people having to try to accumulate information that will be piecemeal in its nature to do that. And I would actually ask that you meet with -- and this is for Public Works as well, meet with AAA, hear out their concerns, hear out what they're looking to obtain. They're supportive of the program, but they feel like there is a need to take a look at the information and see why in particular circumstances it's not performing as well as we would like.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. My question's for Bill Hillman. Bill, how are you? I know you guys took a look at the yellow light time. Have you looked at any of the data of what could occur if you added a second to the yellow light times?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, we have not.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have a study here that was done in Georgia, they changed the law, they added a second to the yellow light times and it actually had an adverse effect. There was an increase of 53% in accidents the first year after, 41% the year after that and 88% the third prior year. So it actually increased the number of accidents when they increased the yellow light times. Can you comment on that, why you think that could be?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, that's been our contention from day one. My Director of Traffic Safety always uses the analogy of yellow clearances and red clearances are like an umpire in baseball; you don't really know he's there until he's doing a bad job. Okay?

When you pull up to an intersection, no one ever even realizes yellow clearances and red clearances because they're set properly. But when they're set improperly, you recognize it. You just feel wrong. You sit there and say, *Why am I waiting so long? You know, nobody's been in the intersection for three seconds. Why am I still sitting here? Why hasn't this light gone green? Is there something wrong?* And if you have a lot of motorists going through that intersection, they tend to disobey the traffic control device. That's why you get increased accidents. When it's set properly, set to the standard timings, you don't even recognize it, it just feels right. You drive up to the intersection and you wait an appropriate amount of time to clear out all the intersections and the next road starts up in an appropriate amount of time. When you start arbitrarily adding or taking away time to those yellow clearances, it's extremely noticeable and has bad consequences.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But you would agree that it would be safe to assume we would have similar results if we were to institute the same practice.

MR. HILLMAN:

Absolutely.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Through the Chair, to the sponsor, if I could. Legislator Trotta?
I just had a couple of questions for you, if I could, through the Chair.

LEG. TROTTA:

Sure.

LEG. LINDSAY:

You had said that you had gone through the accident reports? Was that what you had culled when you were pulling the data or that information.

LEG. TROTTA:

No, the 2013 report, it had fatals, it says pre-construction and post-construction; I'm assuming that's before and after the camera. And it went from two to six, which is apparently a 300% increase.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Are those six accidents or six fatalities?

LEG. TROTTA:

Fatalities.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Could they have all been in the same occurrences?

LEG. TROTTA:

There's one double -- I don't know if it was a double fatal. It just says at that location, two people were killed. It could have been one accident. That's why I don't want to --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Did we pull the MV-104s on the --

LEG. TROTTA:

No, I did not.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Well, I have, through a Freedom of Information, a FOIL request, I got MV-104s for every accident of every intersection that occurred where we had red light cameras.

LEG. TROTTA:

Say that again?

LEG. LINDSAY:

For every accident we've had at red light cameras, where there was an intersection where there's a red light camera, I have the MV-104s for each one of those accidents.

LEG. TROTTA:

What year?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I've got to go through the information, I just received it this morning. So just going through -- as you can imagine, there's a lot. With just doing a quick analysis of 60 rear-end accidents that occurred at intersections, 40 of them occurred while vehicles were stopped, which means the car was stopped, they were waiting for the red light and the car ran into them.

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, can I tell you something?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Let me just go through all the data and we'll --

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, let me stop you and go point-to-point.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

Because the number one rule when you're in a rear-end accident is you tell the police you were stopped.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So they lied on the police report, is what you're saying.

LEG. TROTTA:

Absolutely.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. The second -- (*laughter*). And I know this from the insurance world because I go through it as well.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes. Know that I'm right.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Two of the people fled the scene; four people went through -- five people went through the red light and hit the person that was stopped at the red light in the rear; one person was in the left-hand lane, decided they wanted to make a right-on-red and cut and hit the vehicle in the right lane; four claimed that it was because of the yellow -- because of the yellow light, they were confused by the yellow light and the camera, so there were four people that did actually say that in the police report; three, the light turned green and the person behind them went before the person in front of them; one person claimed their brakes didn't work. So that -- I mean, that's just the 60 that I have here. I'd be happy to meet with you and we'll go through them all of them together.

LEG. TROTTA:

I don't want to -- I'm not -- the whole point of my argument is I'm saying the cameras, either way, it doesn't matter. And I've read reports from Chicago and all these reports, they basically say it doesn't matter. Why are we taking our taxpayers money? Why are we putting people through this?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay, but when we see a reduction in the number of violations, do you not think that that changes driver behavior?

LEG. TROTTA:

I'm not -- this is the 56-mile an hour argument. This is -- you know, at what point do we -- we put our things on our car and we go 56, we get a ticket?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I understand that. But just using your argument, if we were to -- if we were to start ticketing people for going 56 miles an hour, do you think people would stop going 56 miles an hour?

LEG. TROTTA:

At some point. But, you know, what is government's intervention? What do we -- when does it stop? It's about money --

LEG. LINDSAY:

But do you agree that --

LEG. TROTTA:

-- plain and simple.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Do you agree that we have an issue with traffic accidents in Suffolk County?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes, and the cameras have no effect either way. That's exactly my point.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So what would you do -- what would you do, then, to --

LEG. TROTTA:

And I -- and the data -- they put cameras up and there was a 186% increase in accidents. How are we even discussing this?

LEG. LINDSAY:

What would you propose to do, then, to combat --

LEG. TROTTA:

I would take this camera down immediately. And I would have the Police come and sit on certain intersections where they were, I'd have them sit in front of school zones. We have a Police Department, that's their job. That's their job.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, I think the Police Department will be happy to hear we're going to have to hire more police officers.

LEG. TROTTA:

We do need more police officers.

LEG. LINDSAY:

One last comment, through the Chair, to the sponsor. If you want to sit together, I'd be happy to go through -- because I haven't gone through all these reports. I'd be happy to go through them with you.

LEG. TROTTA:

I went through a few on certain intersections, and haven't written a lot of those reports, I know what goes into those reports. It's like bad stuff going in, bad stuff going out. So it's not like, you know, you can take some credence in it. I mean, I was shocked to find out that there was more fatalities. I never even thought in a million years -- and again, you would think I'd be sitting here blaming the red light cameras for six people's deaths, but I'm not.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But even on those fatalities, I think you need more information to really to see what the cause was.

LEG. TROTTA:

I'll go out and a limb and say they didn't have anything to do with it. That's my entire point. The point of it is the cameras are doing nothing except picking the pockets of the taxpayers, plain and simple.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

That's it.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Money, that's all it is.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Paul, I know there were a lot of questions and I haven't really asked any questions myself; and I know, Tom, you have a question. But there was a couple of things. The comment about it being unconstitutional. Now, I know the State of New York approved this; this was approved by the State Legislators. So if it does --

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If it does stop, in order for this -- this is something the State Legislators can put in legislation tomorrow to eliminate the program. But there's talk about Florida and other places. Are you familiar with those states and why -- were they deemed unconstitutional? Have you been able to look into any of those? And why is it unconstitutional in Florida but not in New York? What's the difference?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

I have not looked into the court cases. I am aware that in contradiction to our red light camera, in California, Orange County, the fine is \$500. And in order to appeal it, to say I'm not -- I didn't do it, you have to pay the fine first; so you have to pay the fine, then you can come to court and contest it. So you have states doing a lot of different things. I haven't looked into any of the other ones, but, you know, that state, I can't explain it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I keep hearing about Florida, so I think it would be important for us to try and find out what's the difference between Florida and New York, why Florida is not doing it and why we can.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Florida let the people vote.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And what's the difference as far as the Constitution is concerned.

So the funeral processions is another issue. As you know, I've called your office. I've had a number of funerals, sometimes the fire departments are involved. You can clearly see they're helping -- the fire police are helping to direct traffic, sometimes if we know it's a large procession, I'll give the 7th Precinct a head's up, we might need some assistance, so that's proof and can show. But there are situations where a funeral procession, you know, they're trying to keep up. You know, they're either going to Calverton, they're going to Mt. Pleasant, some of them are going even to Nassau County. So they're trying to keep up with that procession. And I think that there is something that needs to be done for that person who is with that funeral procession, a family member. I don't like the thoughts of someone getting a ticket, you know, when they're at a funeral. And I would like to further talk about that with you to see how can we remedy that problem. I don't think it's fair, you know, for them to receive a ticket. And I know that sometimes there's circumstances can show it and cannot. But that's a further discussion. I think, Leslie, it is something that we really should be addressing.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The \$30 administration fee, we've heard a lot about that, opposition to the \$30 administration fee, okay? Can you speak to that about why we're allowed -- again, why we're allowed to have that administrative fee? Why we couldn't just eliminate it, since they're already paying a fine.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

The administration fee is applied towards the adjudication, to pay for the adjudication. The fine is by statute.

LEG. TROTTE:

What?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

The administration fee is going towards the adjudication. The \$50 is going towards the State-imposed fine. There have been challenges to the \$30, I'm not aware of any successful one. The Governor did pass a bill which kind of acknowledges that you have the right to put an administrative fee on and limited how that can be done, actually causing Nassau to change their policy. So you have a Governor's bill that came out and said you can add an administrative fee, however, if the person's found not guilty or not responsible, that you cannot charge an administrative fee in that situation. So if you read that State law, it acknowledges that there are administrative fees. However, I don't know that the courts have made an absolute determination on the administrative fee about any agency in New York State, and New York City's been doing this for 20 years.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, I know that.

*(*Laughter*)*

MR. MARGIOTTA:

That's right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I got one. But at the same time, with the administrative fee, I guess the question is the cost. When New York State -- when the State had the traffic court, did they have an administrative fee also?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

No, the County did not pay for the court. New York State --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, no, no, when it was in the control of the State. Before we had TPVA.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Oh, yes. No, there was none.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was no administrative fee.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And why not?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Well, the County had no expense. The State had the expense. Everybody worked for the State except for the prosecutor, the Judge, the Clerks, the courtroom, everything. Everything was the State, now they switched it to us.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah. But, however, the revenue comes to us now.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

It always did, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We do get a portion -- the State does get a portion, but we are getting revenue, even through the fine.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Xerox gets 42%, we get 58%.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. But we'll talk more about the administrative fee.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Because that's been an issue for a lot of my constituents.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There's a lady, I believe her name is Mary, and she mentioned an intersection where I remember the accident, a police officer was killed. There is no red light camera there. She mentioned about a red light camera at a location where she didn't think it was appropriate. Why do we not have a red light camera at the location that she believes should have one?

MR. MARGIOTTA:

That would be the engineers.

MR. PREGO:

Back in November we were here and we did about a two-hour presentation on the site selection process. To talk about a specific intersection, we could talk privately about that; I can try to pull the file and then get into the details of it. But again, we examined over 400 intersections, so it's hard to just kind of parse out one out of our brain this second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PREGO:

But as you remember, back in November we went through quite an in-depth process of how we selected the intersections.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right. And, you know, I have -- I mean, we got a statement, a gentleman who sent an e-mail in support of the program. I have a civic group in support of the program. I've had constituents who have called and said, *Well, this is where you need to put a red light camera*. So, you know, you have the people who support it and you have the people who don't, and everybody has a right to have an opinion.

You know, the right-on-red I think is an issue where maybe we should consider doing -- putting up a sign, no right turn on red no matter what. Is there anything that prevents us at every intersection to just put up a sign no right-on-red?

MR. HILLMAN:

Um --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If there's a camera.

MR. HILLMAN:

Oh, just if there's a camera.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If we have a camera at an intersection, is there any law or anything that prohibits us from being able to put up a no-right-on-red? Because I can guarantee you, some people will still go right-on-red anyway.

MR. PREGO:

Well, there's a couple of things on there. There's some misunderstanding over -- and I think, Paul, you can maybe speak to this as well. Nobody gets a ticket for turning on red. Nobody receives a citation for turning on red.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

MR. PREGO:

It's for not stopping at the red.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Correct. But if I come to an intersection and there's a sign that says *no right-on-red*, I'm not going to turn right until the light is green. Now, there are people who are going to violate that anyway and they're going to get a ticket. But, you know, I have two places when I'm going home where there's a red light camera and there is no right-on-red sign; I stop, I make a complete stop. I don't count to three, you just make a complete stop and then you can turn. So it's not rocket science. So that's my issue is, is that there are those people who feel that putting up that no right-on-red sign could help the situation. Is it going to drop the revenue? Probably, but we're not here. The gentleman whose picture is on the wall, our Presiding Officer, when he initiated this, he said this was about safety and it was based on his wife and his daughter being in a couple of T-bones. And I believe that we do have to do something for safety reasons. People don't drive very well.

MR. HILLMAN:

We can look into that. Again, Vehicle and Traffic Law applies. I can't quote it off the top of my head and I wouldn't expect any of my traffic engineers to do that either. It's dangerous when you knee-jerk reaction answer a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

It's technical in nature like this.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

In a public forum without the proper research. So clearly, we can research that. But my knee-jerk reaction is one concern is that highway -- highway engineering is all about consistency. So when you arbitrarily veer from the standard engineering practices for certain intersections, that's when it leads to people doing, say, dangerous maneuvers. I'm not saying that limiting -- putting up a right-on-red would lead to dangerous maneuvers, I'm just saying that when you veer from the norm, you need to try and anticipate what the unintended consequences are. So it's something we can look at if you'd like.

LEG. HAHN:

I actually asked the Administration to consider that in the cases where, you know, there may be most dangerous right-on-red.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Kara, Tom is waiting patiently first.

LEG. HAHN:

For his third time to speak, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You can talk next.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you for allowing me to speak, even though I'm not a member of Public Safety. And you kind of answered -- asked my question. What would happen if we took the red light cameras and put them on intersections where there was no right-on-red? If it's about public safety, it's about reducing intersection accidents, what better place to put it where you can't make the right-on-red, so you're actually violating the law.

You know, on these right-on-reds, when I was a police officer, if I was standing on the corner, I have seen some of these videos, and it happened right in front of me, you know, they do a California stop.

I wouldn't stop them to write a red light camera. The discretion to write or not write is taken away when we use the camera, where we can make the right-on-red. Or the other option is, this is for Counsel, can we as a County make it illegal to make a right on a red light in Suffolk County; can we do that, George?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

(Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN:

I -- something tells me off the top probably no, but I'd have to get back to you on that. I'll look into it.

LEG. MURATORE:

Doesn't New York City have no right-on-red?

MR. NOLAN:

New York City's a whole different animal.

LEG. MURATORE:

I know. But, you know, there's --

MR. NOLAN:

You know, you just want to make -- you just want to prohibit --

LEG. MURATORE:

Right-on-red.

MR. NOLAN:

I'd have to look into it for you, to be honest with you.

LEG. MURATORE:

You know, what impact would it have if we put the cameras at intersections where you are not allowed to make a right-on-red? And we wouldn't have these problems of people saying, *Well, I stopped. I was in a funeral*, you know, I mean, a whole bunch of excuses. We wouldn't have that, then, because you're not allowed to make the right on red; if you did it, you violated the law, you get the summons.

MR. HILLMAN:

I think one of the unintended consequences of that would be that you could miss some of your more dangerous intersections. If a particular intersection is dangerous but you're allowed to make a right-on-red, then we wouldn't put a camera there, and you would then not be protecting that intersection. Again, erring on the side of caution, I think the other approach would be a little more appropriate. But again, I think it needs to be thoroughly reviewed and thought about.

LEG. MURATORE:

One other question is the notification sign that you put up that the camera is monitoring the light; is there a specific formula to decide how far from the light you put the sign?

MR. PREGO:

A couple of things on the sign. First of all, they are not required nor even recommended by the Federal Highway Administration. However they are posted and they are posted at, I believe, 300 feet, which is what the Federal Highway Administration recommends.

LEG. MURATORE:

Can we move them closer?

MR. PREGO:

Since you're traveling at speed, actually moving them closer may not work out as well as you think. The further away, as you approach an intersection, is often the better place.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, like I said before, you know, when you're taught how to drive, the first thing you do when you go into an intersection is you're supposed to be reducing speed. You know, the foot's supposed to go from the gas, come off, take that three-quarters of a second that you may need to go from the gas to the brake and have enough distance to stop without smashing into somebody. But if, you know, we can put the sign closer or -- you know, I think making no right-on-red in Suffolk County -- remember, that was put into effect back in the 70s to save gas, because of the gas shortage, but we're not having a gas shortage anymore. So let's make it illegal to make a right turn on red in Suffolk County and we may not have a problem with the red light cameras.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We could have them because then that would be the T-bone type incidents, is what we're looking to mitigate and eliminate.

So I do not believe we have any more Legislators that want to ask questions. We are already now into the second committee; there was a Ways & Means Committee which we still have to have. So with that, okay, we -- I don't even remember, what were the motions anymore? There was a discharge without recommendation and a second.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

May we leave, Your Honor?

LEG. HAHN:

Madam Chair, I'm going to withdraw my tabling motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I do not believe we are going to need you anymore. Thank you.

MR. MARGIOTTA:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're withdrawing your tabling? Okay. So there was a motion to discharge without recommendation and a second. Okay. And again, this is -- this bill does not take effect until 2017, so the way things stand right now, how our cameras and traffic lights are operating, that will not change between now and then. And I do not disagree that there are some serious issues and serious flaws, and I think that we have the next six months to look at it.

So I was second on the tabling motion. You know, and again, I have constituents who have continually called and said, *Why can't people just stop? You know, why -- why don't you get a red light camera on this intersection?* You know. And, yeah, some people don't like it. I've seen their video and they do not stop; they have just rolled right through, barely touched their brakes, and that's a problem. That is a serious problem. I had one lady said, *Well, the car behind me was going to hit me if I didn't keep going*, and we watched the video and I said, *What car? There is no car behind you.*

So when I have a civic organization in my district who's saying, *We want it* -- and actually, before we even approved it, before it was even approved by the State, the civic organization in my district said, *We need red light cameras*, and they were familiar with it and they were aware of it and had asked for it way before we were even thinking about it. So, you know, some people don't want it, some people do. So I don't believe in suspending a program in '17 when we have the next six months to approve suspending a program start in '17 when we have six months to address the issue.

So I'm not going to support a discharge without recommendation. I do believe that we do have the next six months. If you want to create a committee to look at the red light cameras, a legitimate committee of Legislators with TPVA, with, you know, DPW, AAA, you know, we have had conversation with them, that is something that we should be considering. And let us have some input, because we're the ones who get the calls.

LEG. TROTTA:

I have not had one person ever come up to me -- actually, I did one or two -- and after showing them the data and educating to them what's really going on here, including the woman who was

dragged in here whose daughter was killed, and when I sat down with her and showed her the reality of what was going on, a highly educated woman, not a single person has said to me -- and after viewing the things that, *Oh, this is something we should have.*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, and I agree. The red light cameras do not stop accidents, they do not cause accidents.

LEG. TROTТА:

Well --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

They do not cause fatalities and they do not stop fatalities. However, and I do think it's shameless to use anyone for their agenda, whether it be to support it or to oppose it. I think that's shameless.

LEG. TROTТА:

I think that I've done research, I've read reports from all around the country.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, Legislator Lindsay has the MV-104s.

LEG. TROTТА:

I don't need to do that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think you do.

LEG. TROTТА:

I read -- in other states, I read all the reports and they basically are a wash.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. TROTТА:

Nothing more than money.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So we will call the vote. We will call the vote. There was a motion to discharge and a second. All in favor? A show of hands in favor of discharge without recommendation.

*(*Legislators Cilmi, Kennedy & Spencer raised their hand*)*

Opposed to discharge without recommendation. One, two, three, four. Okay, ***it has failed (VOTE: 3-5-0-0 - Opposed: Legislators Cilmi, Kennedy & Spencer).***

So we'll go to the -- you got that? Okay.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

We the people are going to take action.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So the next --

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

We're going to be your nightmare.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The next bill, **Introductory Resolutions:**

1437-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$1,068,093 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Gun Involved Violence Elimination (GIVE) III Program with 90.84% support (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Hahn. Second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **It's approved (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).**

1462-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law amending the composition of the Child Fatality Review Team (Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is that an approval?

MR. NOLAN:

It has to be tabled.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Tabling, right? It's a Local law.

MR. NOLAN:

Yes, it needs to be tabled.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

A public hearing?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah? Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Hahn makes a motion to table for public hearing. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **It's tabled for public hearing (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).**

1466-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to amend regulations associated with the servicing of automatic fire extinguishing systems (Muratore). It has to be -- I'll make a motion to table for public hearing. Is there a second?

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Cilmi.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

What about Tom? It's his bill.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, he's not on the committee. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You're money grabbing pigs. You're going to be all voted out.

My kid's involved in an accident, they don't give a damn.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Are we ready? I believe there was a motion to table for public hearing and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled for public hearing (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

1471-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to increase penalties for violation of social host laws (Cilmi). That's a public hearing also?

LEG. CILMI:

Yes, public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Motion to table for public hearing, Legislator Cilmi. Second, Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled for public hearing (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

1485-16 - Accepting from New York State one (1) 2016 Boston Whaler, four (4) outboard engines, one (1) 2007 Pro Line and two (2) boat trailers for use by the Suffolk County Police Department Marine Bureau (County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 8-0-0-0).***

And with that, we have nothing more on the agenda. Motion to adjourn.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Fleming. We're adjourned.

Public Safety Committee Meeting - May 26, 2016

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 P.M. *)*

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically